

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
BRESSIE, RAMONA.—"A Gouverneur Wily and Wys,"	477
MURPHREE, A. A., and STRAUCH, C. F.—The Chronology of 'The Return of the Native,'	491
ANDERSON, M. L.—Hardy's Debt to Webster in 'The Return of the Native,'	497
KUNSTMANN, J. G.—'Hildebrandslid 20-22a,'	501
LIVINGSTON, C. H.—Old French 'Belluré,'	506
QUYNN, D. M.—The Identity of 'M. T. Coyfurelly,'	510
KENNEDY, R. L.—'La Gala del nadar'—Date and Authorship,	514
PRIVITERA, J. F.—Molière in Franche-Comté,	517
LANCASTER, H. C.—Saint-Réal's 'Don Carlos' and 'Phèdre,' 1093-6,	519
REMAK, H. H.—A Bibliographical Note on Voltaire,	520
SEEBER, E. D.—Faiguët, réformateur de l'orthographe,	523
MALONE, KEMP.—Some Linguistic Studies of 1937 and 1938,	525

REVIEWS:—

R. K. ROOT, The Poetical Career of Alexander Pope. [George Sherburn.]	541
F. O. NOLTE, Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe. [D. Lasher-Schlitt.]	543
F. A. VOIGT and W. A. REICHART, Hauptmann und Shakespeare; H. BAENSTORFF, Die soziale, politische und wirtschaftliche Zeitkritik im Werke Gerhart Hauptmanns. [H. Steinhauer.]	545
W. VON WARBURG, Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker. [Leo Spitzer.]	547
G. BERTONI, Lingua e cultura. [Leo Spitzer.]	548
F. VARNUM, Un Philosophe cosmopolite du XVIII ^e Siècle, le Chevalier de Chastellux. [G. Chinard.]	550
F. C. RIEDEL, Crime and Punishment in Old French Romances. [S. Painter.]	551
M. E. MAXFIELD, Studies in Modern Romansh Poetry in the Engadine. [H. H. Vaughan.]	552
L. SOMERI, Boccaccio's Story of Tito e Gisippo in European Literature. [D. P. Rotunda.]	553

BRIEF MENTION: F. LOT, Joseph Bédier; M. FRANÇON, Poèmes de transition; DEFERRARI, BARRY, McGUIRE, A Concordance to Ovid,	554
---	-----

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMeyer

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C. S. SINGLETON

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNE.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

The General Index of volumes 1 to 50, xii + 310 pages, was published in December 1935. The price is \$5.00 net.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE GENIUS OF THE GERMAN LYRIC

An Historical Survey of its Formal and Metaphysical Values

By A. CLOSS, *Head of the Germ. Dep., University of Bristol*

SOME ENGLISH REVIEWS

SPECTATOR: "For minute and careful research, and as a chronicle of knowledge, there is nothing to compare with it in the history of English song."
SCOTSMAN: "Closs is a man of immense learning, and on the form and the contemporary spirit of the various periods of German lyrical poetry he has much to tell the ordinary student. . . . The book is delightful to read. To the student . . . the book will be invaluable."
CONTEMPORARY REVIEW: "Closs is able to speak in perfect freedom. He extols nothing unduly and withholds nothing from us. This book is, and will remain, an outstanding achievement."

SOME AMERICAN REVIEWS

MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL: "The first comprehensive study of the German lyric to be published in any language. . . . It is a new and important contribution to the literature of its field, and should be in every college library."
ANGLO-GERMAN REVIEW: "This is a pioneer book. Professor Closs gives us here the fruit of many years of his own study and research, in which he reveals himself as an independent thinker and a sound critic."
THE GERMAN QUARTERLY: "The book is an outstanding contribution to the study of the German lyric."

478 pages. 18s. net

MESSRS. ALLEN & UNWIN, LONDON

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

editors
on the
script
articles
to the
ies of
Quo-
3, not
MP,
editors
business

IC

compare
various
ightful
holds

in any
be in
ears of
ic."

Modern Language Notes

Volume LIV

NOVEMBER, 1939

Number 7

"A GOVERNOUR WILY AND WYS"

Hunting monks seem to have been common in Chaucer's time,¹ but only one is known to be on record, William de Cloune, abbot of Leicester, and he has escaped the notice of editors of Chaucer.² This paper studies the Monk in the *Canterbury Tales* using Cloune as an example.³

The abbey chronicler says that Cloune was "the most famous and notable hunter of hares among all the lords of the realm, so that the King himself, his son Prince Edward, and many lords of the realm were bound under a yearly pension to hunt with him."⁴ As with the Monk,

Of prikyng and of huntynge for the hare
Was al his lust . . .⁵

¹G. M. Trevelyan, *Age of Wyclif* (London, 1904), p. 159, citing the Monk and passages in *Piers Plowman* and the *Vox Clamantis*.

²Cloune is noticed only by A. H. Thompson, "Monasteries of Leicestershire in the fifteenth century," *Transactions of the Leicestershire archaeological society*, XI (Leicester, 1913), 98 ff. No editor of Chaucer has ever cited any contemporary example in illustration of the Monk.

³The material used in this article is almost all in print,—the brief biography of the abbot in the Leicester chronicle and some of the chronicler's record sources which are accessible in the calendars of the rolls, the abbey records in Thomas Hearne's appendix to John Nichols' *History and antiquities of the county of Leicester* (London, 1795-1815), and the borough records. All the earlier abbey muniments had disappeared before Hearne's time; only some of the late fifteenth century compilations of William Charite survive. See note 47.

⁴Henry Knighton, *Chronicon*, ed. J. R. Lumby (Rolls series, London, 1889-95), II, 127: "In venatione leporum inter omnes regni dominos famosissimus et nominatissimus habebatur, ita ut ipse rex, et princeps filius ejus Edwardus, et plures domini de regno cum eo retenti erant sub annua pensione leporare."

⁵*Canterbury Tales*, lines 191-2.

But the abbot often declared in private that it was not these "frivolities" that he enjoyed so much as paying deference to the wishes of his noble patrons and having the benefits of their patronage.⁶ The chief of the nobles who hunted with King Edward III at Leicester was the duke of Lancaster, the patron of the abbey, and he and the King made a favorite of the abbot. "God gave him such grace in the eyes of all," remarks the abbey chronicler, "that scarcely any one ever denied him anything he asked,"⁷ and he asked for manors, endowments, churches and chapels, increments, exemptions, dispensations, even—in jest—for a license to hold a greyhound fair at the abbey. The King responded with a formal grant.⁸ The duke made petitions to the King and the pope in the abbey's behalf,⁹ and imparked the abbey wood and stocked it with deer out of Leicester Forest.¹⁰ Cloune was abbot from November, 1345 to his death in January, 1378, and the King's grants are dated 1347, 1351, 1352, 1357, 1361, 1363, 1366, and 1370; Edward was especially generous in 1352—the year the duke imparked the abbey wood—and in 1363.¹¹ This was Edward's

⁶ Knighton, II, 127: "Ipse tamen saepius voluit asserere in secretis, se non delectasse in hujusmodi frivolis venationibus nisi solum pro obsequiis dominis regni praestandis, et affabilitate eorum captanda et gratiam in suis negotiis adipiscenda."

⁷ *Loc. cit.*: "Isti benigno abbati Willelmo deus tantam gratiam in oculis omnium tam dominorum quam aliorum contulit, quod vix erat aliquis qui ei quod petebat negaret."

⁸ *Loc. cit.*: "In tantum enim affabilis erat domino regi, quod burdando petebat a rege mundinas sibi concedi pro leporariis et aliis canibus cujuscumque conditionis essent emendis et vendendis. Rex vero credens ipsum mundinas affectuose petisse, ei concessit quod petebat, abbas vero noluit instare circa negotium."

⁹ *Calendar of the patent rolls of Edward III*, IX, 146, and *Calendar of entries in the papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Petitions to the Pope*, I, 226.

¹⁰ Knighton, II, 74.

¹¹ *Calendar of the patent rolls of Edward III*, VII, 430, grant of lands, 1347; IX, 146, license to appropriate Hungarton church, 1351; IX, 269 and 230, grant of lands including Ingwardby, the abbey's best grange, and exemption of the abbot from attending Parliament, 1352; X, 576, license to enclose a way enlarging the abbey woods, 1357; XII, 99, grant of the manor of Kirkby Mallory and the advowson of the manor church, 1361; XII, 413 and 415, provision for the maintenance of two monks at the university, and exemption of the abbey from delivery into the hands of the King's escheator on the death of the abbot, 1363; XIII, 4, pardon to Henry Knighton at the

jubilee year and he hunted "through the forests of Rogyngnam, Clyve, and Schyrevode, and other forests, parks, and woods," including Leicester Forest, for the chronicler mentions the King's presence at the abbey. He had three royal guests, the kings of France, Scotland, and Cyprus,¹² the same Peter of Cyprus whose "tragedie" is told in the *Monk's Tale*. Frequent royal visits are implied in the abbot's yearly pension. Then, too, the journey to York or Scotland was customarily broken at Leicester;¹³ for instance, King Edward was at the abbey for four days in July, 1336, on his way to Scotland, and the Queen was there about two weeks later on her return from the North.¹⁴ Edward's visits are not easily traced in the records, however, after the first decade of his reign.¹⁵ He was at Leicester for three days before Christmas in 1345 for the funeral of the earl Henry, and he was invited to the duke Henry's funeral in March, 1361. The borough made presents to the King's fool in 1357-8 and to the King's archers in 1358-9,¹⁶ probably on the occasion of the marriage of Blanche of Lancaster and John of Gaunt. The King dated his letters patent and close at Leicester in January, 1346, and Parliament met there in 1349. As for the duke, the borough accounts record

instance of the abbot, 1370; *Calendar of the close rolls*, XII, 222-3, restoration of Cockerham in Lancashire to the abbey, 1366. Further acquisitions of lands are mentioned by Knighton, II, 126, and two suits won by the abbot, by Knighton, II, 112-3, and Nichols, I, 285. The King's pardon to Walter Wynkeburne (see below note 12) would date the King's presence at the abbey in 1363 but is not in the printed calendars of the rolls.

¹² Knighton, II, 118-9; his presence is mentioned as a circumstance incidental to the pardon of a man who survived hanging at Leicester. The chaplain of the King of France wrote a treatise on hunting, W. and F. Baillie-Grohman, "A French king's hunting book written while a prisoner in England by his chaplain, Gace de la Buigne," *Fortnightly Review*, LXXXI, (London, 1904), 789.

¹³ Nichols, I, 256, and William Kelly, *Royal progresses and visits to Leicester* (Leicester, 1884), *passim*, especially pp. 146-9 for the reign of Edward III; also Knighton, II, 204, 233, 240 for Richard's visits in 1384 on the way to Scotland, in 1386 on the way to York, and in 1387. His letters patent are dated there in 1385 in July, August, and September.

¹⁴ *Records of the borough of Leicester, 1103-1603*, ed. Mary Bateson (Cambridge, 1901), II, 27.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 7, 10, 16, 52, for Edward's visits in 1327, in 1332 at Michaelmas, in 1334 at Quinquagesima, in 1342 at Candlemas.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 65, and 108-9.

purchases of wine and bread when Henry hunted in the Frith at Assumption (August 15) in 1343-4, and of beer "consumed at the wood" by the mayor and others "when the lord hunted in the forest" in 1350-51.¹⁷ John of Gaunt was customarily at Leicester Castle in August,¹⁸ and held a great hunting-party there in August, 1390.¹⁹

Leicester abbey, already wealthy,²⁰ prospered greatly by the generosity of the King and the duke. For all the ruinous expense of frequent royal visits, the abbot had plenty of money, his extensive building shows. He built the abbot's hall and the abbey gates,²¹ and between the hall and the inner gate was the King's Lodging, a tower with a turret, a tile roof, stone chimneys, glazed windows, several suites of rooms, and a gallery leading to the great dining chamber at the upper end of the abbot's hall. The hall was in the inner court.²² In the outer or entrance court were the stables. Here the hunt would assemble. Outside the entrance were more stables, and beyond lay the abbey deer park, the Frith, and Leicester Forest. Any of the King's retinue, staying the night at the abbey, might wake just as Chaucer wakes in the *Book of the Duchess*:

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 60, and 76.

¹⁸ He was there in August, 1373, 1374, and 1375, *John of Gaunt's Register*, ed. Sydney Armitage-Smith (Royal historical society, Camden third series, London, 1911), *passim*.

¹⁹ Knighton, II, 313.

²⁰ The abbey's yearly income was about £1180, Thompson, "Monasteries of Leicestershire in the fifteenth century," p. 99, its net income, £780, *Visitations of the diocese of Lincoln, 1426-49*, ed. A. H. Thompson (Canterbury and York society, XXIV, London, 1915-27), II, 213.

²¹ Nichols, I, 262, and Appendix, p. 71.

²² Joseph Burtt, "Survey of the abbey of St. Mary de Pratis nigh Leicester, temp. Henry VIII," *Archaeological Journal*, XXVII (London, 1870), 204 ff.: ". . . And at the entree out of the bascourt to the same standyth a tower the forefrunte all bryke with a turret well proporecyoned callyd the Kynges lodgyng, wherein ys two fayr chaumberes with wyndowes glasyd with chymneys and two inner chaumberes with chymneys, and belawe a parler with two iner chaumberes of lyke proporecyon and a gallere leydyng from the seyde tower belawe to iij chaumberes with chymneys and to the hall, all of stone and coveryd with tyell, and to serten chaumberes above and belawe for offycers, and a hyghe galere above leydyng from the foresayd tower at the gate to iiij chaumberes above with chymneys, and to the gret dynyng chaumber standyth on hyghe at the upper end of the Hall . . ."

... I was waked
 With smale foules a gret hepe

 ... they sate . . .
 Upon my chambre roof withoute
 Upon the tyles over al aboute
 And songen . . .

 My wyndowes weren shet echon
 And through the glas the sunne shon
 Upon my bed with brighte bemes

 And as I lay thus, wonder lowde
 Me thoghte I herde an hunte blowe
 Tassaye his horn, and for to knowe
 Whether hit were clere, or hors of soune.
 And I herde goyng, bothe up and doune;
 Men, hora, houndes, and other thyng,
 And al men spoken of huntynge.²³

The abbot was, then, like the Monk,

... a fair for the maistrye,

 A manly man to been an abbot able,²⁴

for by his hunting the abbey enjoyed a prosperity that would have been impossible otherwise; and he was more "able" than if he had observed scrupulously what "Austyn bit" as to hunting and hunting dogs, for he would have been less pleasing to the King and the duke, and his abbey would have prospered the less for it. The hand of the "governour wily and wys" is easily suspected in the statute passed by the Chapter of the Augustinian order which met at Leicester abbey in 1346,—that hunting dogs were not to be kept, but if they were kept at least they were not to be allowed in the refectory to eat the broken victuals that should go to the poor.²⁵

²³ Lines 295-6, 298-301, 335-7, 344-50.

²⁴ *Canterbury Tales*, lines 165 and 167.

²⁵ H. E. Salter, *Chapters of the Augustinian canons* (Canterbury and York society, xxix, London, 1922), p. 56: "Quod canonici non habeant canes hora prandii coram se," a variant of the prohibition in the Constitutions of Pope Benedict XII for the order, *Ibid.*, Appendix II, xxxiv: "Porro a venacionibus et aucupacionibus canonici dicte religionis abstineant, nec eis interesse aut canes ad opus venandi nec aves venaticas per se vel per alios tenere presumant, nisi saltus, vivaria vel guarennas proprias

Any Augustinian prior or abbot was likely to be, like the Monk, "an outrider" and "kepere of the celle."

An outridere that lovede venerye

Ful many a deyntee hors hadde he in stable
And whan he rood men myghte his brydel heere
Gynglen in a whistlynge wynd als cleere
And eek as loude, as dooth the chapel belle,
Ther as this lord was kepere of the celle.²⁶

As the monasteries acquired more and more lands, the Augustinians came to live on the manors in small convents, each with its keeper or prior. The abbot came to have his own household, and he travelled about visiting the convents or cells, accompanied by one monk if he had one cell to govern, by two if he had two or three cells.²⁷ In the *Shipman's Tale*, Daun John, the outrider, travels with his abbot after the Augustinian custom, for he says to the merchant,

Oure abbot wole out of this toun anon,
And in his campaignye moot I goon.²⁸

The abbot of Leicester had several cells to govern,—Westgate at Leicester, Stoughton in the parish of Thurnby, Medoplek in the Peak in Derbyshire, Cockerham in Lancashire, and Ingwardby in the parish of Hungarton.²⁹ Only Ingwardby, the abbey's best grange,

vel ius venandi in alienis haberent. Quo casu hoc eis permittitur dum tamen infra monasterium seu domos quas inhabitant aut eorum clausuras canes venaticos non teneant, nec venacioni presenciam exhibeant personalem. Sic qui vero eorum venacioni aut aucupacioni, clamose vel alias, cum canibus vel avibus ex proposito interfuerint, si quidem abbas fuerit vel prior seu prepositus aut alius administrator quicumque non habens superiorem eiusdem religionis per annum se noverit a beneficiorum collacione suspensum."

²⁶ Lines 166 and 168-72.

²⁷ J. W. Clark, *Observances in use at the Augustinian priory of Barnwell* (Cambridge, 1897), pp. xxxv-vi, and 47. Nichols, I, 280, on the authority of William Charite, says that at each of the principal abbey granges, a monk had the title of master or prior, and the *custos* of Cockerham in 1360, John Derby, is noted from the Coram Rege Roll in the *Victoria County History*, Lancashire, II, 153.

²⁸ Lines 1551-2.

²⁹ Nichols, IV, 565-6, on Westgate or Westcotes, II, 851 on Stoughton, III, 291-3 on Ingwardby, I, 281 on Medoplek; on Cockerham, Kirby Mallory, and Ingwardby or Ingarsby, note 11 above.

had a chapel like the Monk's cell.³⁰ This grange had belonged to the Aungervilles, and it came to the abbey as part of the endowment of the chantry of Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1352. In 1439 the abbot was residing at Ingwardby and going to the abbey for chapter meetings. Two monks complained to the bishop that he had charged the brethren in general in chapter with theft of money belonging to him, and afterwards had practised magic at Ingwardby to discover the guilty monk. Then he came again into chapter and accused one of the two who complained to the bishop.³¹ As for horses, some of the patron's horses were stabled at the abbey, for the borough records mention "the keeper of the earl's horses at the abbey."³² A generation before Cloune's time the earl was spending about £485 a year to maintain 1500 "great horses" at Leicester,³³ the famous Leicester breed, the largest in England, it is said,³⁴ and the war-horses of the age of armored knights.

The Monk, like the abbot,³⁵ makes apology for his hunting. He begins with a remark about the Benedictine rule which has been taken to be evidence that he is a Benedictine,³⁶

The reule of seint Maure or of seint Beneit,
Bycause that it was old and somdel streit,—
This ilke Monk leet olde thynges pace
And heeld after the newe world the space.³⁷

³⁰ The abbey built a chapel at Stoughton in the village, not at the grange, William Burton, *Description of Leicestershire* (Lynn, 1777), p. 257. The chapel at Cockerham was burnt with the rest of the buildings in 1335, Knighton, I, 476. The abbey acquired Ingwardby chapel with the grange. The place is still known locally as "the Chapel," though the chapel had disappeared in Nichols' time. There is a description of Ingarsby Old Priory, with drawings of Tudor buildings still standing, in "Excursion to Houghton-on-Hill, Ingarsby, and Quenby," by S. T. Winckley, *Transactions of the Leicestershire archaeological society*, x (Leicester, 1909-10), 254-6.

³¹ *Visitations of the diocese of Lincoln*, II, 211-2.

³² Bateson, II, 16; in the *Visitations*, II, 209, the abbey revenues are mentioned as "the issues of mares and wool."

³³ Nichols, I, 223, from John Strype's edition of Stow's *Survey*.

³⁴ Nichols, II, part I, 4. The prior of Wymondley had, like the Monk, a "red" palfrey which was valued at 60s., *Calendar of the patent rolls of Edward III*, XII, 182.

³⁵ See above note 6, for the abbot's apology.

³⁶ Oliver F. Emerson, "Some of Chaucer's lines on the Monk," *Modern Philology*, I (Chicago, 1903), 105-15.

³⁷ Lines 173-6.

The Benedictine rule was already centuries "old" when the Augustinian order originated in the late eleventh century with the organization of the clergy of collegiate churches under a rule derived from the writings of Augustine of Hippo; and it was "sommel streit" to the Augustinian, not only to the monk who lived on the monastery lands like a lord of the manor, but even to the monk who lived by the rule.³⁸ The Augustinian, both priest and monk, was spared the long hours of choral duty, the labor, the simplicity of dress and diet, and the discipline of the Benedictine, and he was ridiculed by the Benedictine as pleasure-loving and self-indulgent, and given to feasting, drinking, and minstrelsy.³⁹ The Augustinian rule explains that St. Augustine had "tempered the severity of this rule so as to include even those who were in bodily sickness."⁴⁰ The rule forbade living out of cloister, but permitted separate quarters to the sick, the aged, and officers of the monastery according to the demands of their duties.⁴¹ Any monk who chose to be an Augustinian rather than a Benedictine "leet olde thynges pace" to a certain degree, while Cloune "for the space" of the reign of a king "that lovede venerye," "leet olde thynges pace" which were still kept by more conventional and less prosperous Augustinians. Leicester abbey "heeld after the newe world" in doctrine too; it was notoriously Lollard.⁴² Wyclif taught that life in the world is better than life in the cloister.⁴³ Chaucer reports the Monk's own version of this doctrine in the lines,

He yaf nat of that text a pulled hen
That seith that hunters beth nat hooly men,
Ne that a Monk whan he is recchelees
Is likned til a fissh that is waterlees;
This is to seyn, a Monk out of his cloystre.
But thilke text heeld he nat worth an oystre;
And I seyde his opinioun was good.⁴⁴

Everybody, rich and poor, humble and powerful, his patrons and

³⁸ Clark, p. 33: "Many choose a strict rule, scanty food, coarse dress; others a less severe rule, more delicate food, and softer dress."

³⁹ Nigel Wireker, *Speculum stultorum*, ed. Thomas Wright, *Anglo-Latin satirical poets of the twelfth century* (London, 1872), pp. 89-90.

⁴⁰ Clark, p. 35.

⁴¹ Salter, Appendix II, no. XXIX.

⁴² Trevelyan, *Age of Wyclif*, pp. 313-21.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

⁴⁴ Lines 177-83.

his convent, "seyde" the abbot's "opinioun was good."⁴⁵ He presented the abbey with two copies of the *Decretales* in which the Monk's texts on hunting and living out of cloister occur,⁴⁶ and with two volumes of commentary and the Pauline epistles glossed by himself.⁴⁷ The abbot would, according to custom, have a collection of books for his own use at the hall at the abbey and at Ingwardby, his country residence. Through Cloune, there were Oxford scholars to study in the abbey cloister.⁴⁸ There were scribes too to write in the scriptorium,⁴⁹ and scores of lay servants in the monastery and the barnyard.⁵⁰ But no one could fill the abbot's place "serving the world" as "the most famous and notable hunter of hares among all the lords of the realm." If he had devoted himself to study and labor, how indeed would the "new world" have been served, not only the fashionable world, the King, the Prince, the duke of Lancaster, and the other nobles who required this new kind of service of the abbot in return for their patronage, but also the Leicester monks⁵¹ themselves who reaped the benefits of their

⁴⁵ Knighton, II, 126: "Hic bonorum operum sectator incessabilis; subditis et minoribus mitis et affabilis; majoribus et magnatibus regni inedicibiliter amabilis."

⁴⁶ W. W. Skeat, *Complete works of Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894-97), v, 20.

⁴⁷ MS Laud 623 (Bodleian Library, Oxford), folio 8v, line 18, folio 42r, line 2, folio 41v, line 27, folio 43r, line 3, from a photostat copy which I have by courtesy of the Bodleian Library, one of a collection of photostats purchased out of the stipend of the Alice Freeman Palmer Memorial Fellowship, the American Association of University Women, 1933-4, to be placed in an American library as the gift of the Fellowship. The Thorney abbey list of borrowers in MS Tanner 10 (Bodleian Library) shows a copy of the *Decreta* kept out by the "lord abbot" year after year. Some names of borrowers have been erased in MS Laud 623, and Thomas Hearne cites MS Laud 625 as his source for an "Indentura precentoris de omnibus libris traditis per ipsum quibuscumque fratribus" of Charite's time, Nichols, I, part 2, 70, but no longer in the Laud MS and not known in the Bodleian Library. My acknowledgments are due to J. R. Liddell of the Bodleian Library who examined MS Laud 625 for this record.

⁴⁸ See above note 11.

⁴⁹ Nichols, I, 276, notes three scribes mentioned in an early deed.

⁵⁰ *Visitations*, II, 210, in 1439 there were fifty-two servants in the monastery and eighteen in the barnyard. Manual labor was held to be unworthy of the Augustinians of Chetwode in 1446, Salter, p. 114. For the Augustinian rule as to labor, Clark, pp. 21-2.

⁵¹ Knighton, II, 127; also note 11 above. The abbey had for each monk a church, a chapel, and two mills, Nichols, I, 279. There were about twenty-

abbot's hunting in manors, granges, and farms, mills and woods, churches and chapels, rents and tenements, in an endowment for their education at the university, in appointments as abbots and priors to neighboring monasteries, in the vigorous intellectual freedom which the Wyclifite tendencies of the abbey attest, and in the peace, security, and independence which the house enjoyed in the shelter of the favor and power of the King and the dukes of Lancaster; as with the Monk,

Lat Austyn have his swynk to him reserved.
 Therefore he was a prikasour aright;
 Grehoundes he hadde as swift as fowel in flight;
 Of prikyng and of huntyng for the hare
 Was al his lust, for no cost wolde he spare.⁵²

"No cost wolde he spare" in order to have the benefits of the patronage of the great. The chronicler says he spared no cost in the interests of peace among all men,⁵³ whatever this may mean; and it could not be said that he spared any cost in his hunting, even though the King's Lodging may not have been provided with windows "y-wrought" with "al the storie of Troye" and walls painted with "al the Romaunce of the Rose."⁵⁴ Even in the abbot's pension and all the rich grants which the abbey had of his generous patrons, there may not have been full recompense for his lavish expenditure in hospitality, for the abbey's wealth steadily declined from about 1335.⁵⁵

To summarize the Monk's apology for his hunting, he explains first how it is that he prefers to be an Augustinian rather than a Benedictine, and then goes on to show that he is not the old-fashioned kind of Augustinian to whom Cloune made excuses for his hunting, but a liberal, ready to "leet pace" "the olde thynges"

five monks, MS Laud 623, folios 47^r-48^v, Nichols, I, 274; also *Visitations*, II, 207 ff., about fifteen mentioned in 1439.

⁵² Lines 188-92.

⁵³ Knighton, II, 126: "Hic pacis et tranquillitatis amator erat, hic discordiarum et injuriarum in patria sua et ubique reformator fuit, quas suis temporibus ubique motus pro suo posse, pro labore vel expensis non omitens, reformare et pacificare totis viribus elaborare studuit, sanguinis semper abhorrens et pertimescens effusionem."

⁵⁴ *Book of the Duchess*, lines 321-4.

⁵⁵ Nichols, I, 279; the abbey pleads extraordinary expenses for hospitality in a petition to the pope, see above, note 9.

that "Austyn bit,"—study and labor and living in cloister,—in order to render the new kind of service which the "new world" required of this hunter of hares,—that he hunt. The phrases, "how shal the world be served?" and "no cost wolde he spare," fit very aptly the abbot's peculiar economic relation to the patrons who hunted with him. Nothing is known of the abbot that suggests an explanation of the Monk's reference to St. Maure; he speaks as if he had made a choice, like Alexander Necham, between the Benedictine and Augustinian orders, and had considered a French Benedictine house. No records of the abbot are known before his election in 1345. A William de Cloune was a wealthy burgess of Leicester, admitted to the Gild of Merchants by special order of the earl in 1318, in Parliament in 1332, steward in 1333-4, mayor in 1338-9, and bailiff from 1338 to 1343 when he disappears from the records two years before the abbot's election.⁵⁶

Chaucer's lines on the Monk's person, though they ridicule, suggest that his appearance was striking and prepossessing,⁵⁷ as does the chronicler's remark that the abbot's "face and his presence were inexpressibly gracious to everyone,"⁵⁸ though of course compliments of this kind were a convention. As for the Monk's dress,⁵⁹ fur was forbidden all Augustinians except dignitaries of the church, and lambskin was prescribed for the lining of cassock and hood; but the brasses of the fifteenth century show that Augustinians of that time wore cassocks lined with fur and hoods made entirely of grys with the tails hanging around the hem as a fringe. The Augustinian hood was put on like a shawl and usually not joined in front though it was sometimes fastened, like the Monk's, with a morse,⁶⁰

And for to festne his hood under his chyn
He hadde of gold y-wroght a ful curious pyn,
A love-knotte in the gretter end ther was.⁶¹

The love-knot in medieval symbolism signifies the *summum bonum*.

⁵⁶ Bateson, I, 309, and II, 13, 17, 18, 39, 450, 460.

⁵⁷ Lines 198-202.

⁵⁸ Knighton, II, 126: "vultus ejus et presentia divitibus et pauperibus omnibus inenarrabiliter desiderabilis."

⁵⁹ Lines 193-4.

⁶⁰ Clark, pp. lxxv-xxx, and sources, and for the prohibition on furs in the Constitutions of Pope Benedict XII, Salter, p. 247, no. XIX.

⁶¹ Lines 195-7.

It is expounded at length in Thomas Usk's *Testament of Love* in an elaborate allegory associating the knot with a pearl and a tree. The subject of Usk's first book is the pearl, of his second the knot, and of his third the tree.⁶² Usk says that "the blis of paradyse to mennes sory hertes in this tre abydeth," the knot "closeth hertes so togider that rancour is outthresten," and "the knotte in the herte," or "parfit blisse," is to be achieved not by riches, dignity, power, or renown, but by virtue of the pearl which is "grace, lerning, or els wisdom of God, or els holy church."⁶³ A similar symbol is painted on one of the remnants of the medieval windows in the old town hall at Leicester (c. 1500),—a knot formed by a tasseled cord drawn through and looped within a braided wreath above the knot, and intricately tied around standing tree fragments below it; the whole is surrounded by a circle with the chalice emblem of the Corpus Christi guild of Leicester repeated five time above the circle and four below.⁶⁴ The original design of the windows may have symbolized the relation of the hall to the guild.⁶⁵ The knot symbol is here used by a guild, and Usk was much involved in guild affairs; the knot, then, may possibly have been in common use as a symbol of fraternity. If so, the Monk's pin may imply an interest in some religious fraternity such as the Corpus Christi guild at Leicester. As for the Monk's boots, shoes were prescribed by the Augustinian rule, but the Leicester monks wore boots by a papal dispensation of Cloune's time.⁶⁶ The Monk's favorite roast, a swan, was very expensive at Leicester; a heron cost 3s., a pheasant 1s. 6d., a goose 3d., a chicken 2½d., and a capon or partridge, 2d., but a swan for the earl's Christmas dinner cost 6s., and for the judges' dinner 7s.⁶⁷ Perhaps Chaucer implies that the Monk was fond of high festivities of this kind, and was usually invited. The abbey might fatten

⁶² W. W. Skeat, *Chaucerian and other pieces* (Oxford, 1897), I, summarized in note 3, p. 24, of my article, "The date of Thomas Usk's *Testament of Love*," *Modern Philology*, xxvi (Chicago, 1928).

⁶³ *Chaucerian and other pieces*, p. 56, lines 94-5; p. 80, lines 85-6; p. 145, lines 102-3.

⁶⁴ Nichols, I, 353-4, plate 31, no. 14.

⁶⁵ A. B. McDonald, "The stained glass in the mayor's parlor," *Transactions of the Leicestershire archaeological society*, XIII (Leicester, 1923-4), 69.

⁶⁶ Nichols, I, 262; but see Salter, pp. xxvii-viii on boots.

⁶⁷ Bateson, II, *passim*, cf. the index on Prices, and pp. 15, 27, 45.

its own swans, for it had water mills and at least one moated manor house, at Kirkby Mallory.⁶⁸

There were greyhounds at Leicester abbey, "a great crowd of useless hounds" consuming the alms, as late as 1439, but the abbot of that time was lavishing the abbey's wealth on alchemy to the "grievous damage" of the house,⁶⁹ and it is certain that after Cloune's time whatever royal favor the abbots enjoyed was not due to the King's pleasure in their talents with hounds and hares, though Cloune was quite likely to make skilful hunters of some of the younger monks, and the King and the duke in hunting with the abbot might start a fashion among the gentry who had monasteries in their patronage. When Cloune died about six months after King Edward and almost a year after Wyclif's trial, the "new world" of his time was already giving place to a still newer world. The liberalism of Edward's reign was passing. Leicester abbey, always a favorite with the king, followed the trend of the times and in Richard's reign turned away from Lollardry and reverted to "the olde thynges" which had been "leet pace." Philip de Repindon, the most distinguished Leicester monk of this "new world," had been associated with Wyclif at Oxford, but recanted and afterwards became abbot and then bishop of Lincoln. Like Repindon, the intellectual, conventional, irreproachable Monk of the prologue and epilogue to the *Monk's Tale* is of this new era, while the Monk of the *Prologue* is of the older era, though both are hunters. Is Cloune the person who has been sought in the records as the living model portrayed—presumably—in the Monk?⁷⁰ The available evidence is inadequate to prove that he is or that he is not, as in all identifications of the Pilgrims that have been proposed except that of Harry Bailly, keeper of the Tabard Inn, with the Host. There is much in the chronicler's account of the abbot that cannot be explained for lack of records, and the abbot's history fails to explain every detail in the lines on the Monk in the *Prologue*. Then too no attempt has been made here to exhaust the records of Cloune and his abbey, and of other hunting monks and their monasteries. Further, if Chaucer composed the sketch in the *Prologue* after King

⁶⁸ Nichols, iv, 764, note, and ii, 851, on the mill at Stoughton.

⁶⁹ *Visitations*, ii, 208.

⁷⁰ John M. Manly, *Some new light on Chaucer* (New York, 1926), pp. 261-2, 221-2.

Edward's death and as a satire on Cloune, the best time for its reception at court was passed; if he composed it before Edward's death, then he was—contrary to the general belief that he did not begin the *Canterbury Tales* before 1387—at work on the *Prologue* at least a decade earlier than has been supposed, or he used old material in the *Prologue* as well as in the *Tales*, and the life of Cloune in the chronicle was written after Chaucer's sketch. In short, in order to know whether Cloune is or is not the Monk, it would be necessary to know much more about hunting monks and about Chaucer and the *Canterbury Tales* than is possible now. The date 1387 is of course hypothetical, not proved, and any consideration of it is beyond the scope of this paper. Here it should be noticed—but without any but tentative inferences—that the chronicler's statement that the abbot was the foremost hunter of hares in the realm "so that" he hunted with the King, implies that he was the only "hunter of hares" who was honored with the King's patronage. If he were, then at court and in the household of Lancaster, for those who had hunted with the abbot, Chaucer's Monk would inevitably recall Cloune's hounds, his "prikyng" for the hare, his protestations of his virtue, and the flourishing prosperity of his house, the reward of his peculiar sort of virtue; in the phrases, "how shal the world be served?" and "no cost wolde he spare," there would be definite allusion to the abbot's economic relation to his patrons; the Monk's cell would signify the opulence of Ingwardby, the richest of the gifts in which the abbot was indulged; and in the Monk's "deyntee" horses there would be a reminder of the ludicrous rôle of the abbot among the great and fashionable,—perhaps too of the glory of the house of Lancaster in the history of English chivalry. The King was hunting at Leicester before Chaucer began to see the world as page to the countess of Ulster in 1357-8, and by 1370, the time of the *Book of the Duchess*, the King and his train had many a time hunted in Leicester Forest and then left for the North as the Emperor and the hunt ride away toward Richmond at the end of the poem, and of course no English forest is so suitable as Leicester for the scene of the elegy for the heiress of Lancaster.

RAMONA BRESSIE

Chicago, Ill.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF *THE RETURN OF THE NATIVE*

In a recent article it was stated that in writing *The Return of the Native* Hardy "had before him the calendar for the year 1842" and that throughout the story "he paid careful attention to dates."¹ His accuracy, it is further stated, "is certainly to be traced to the early studies of the young architect."² That Hardy actually had a calendar for the year 1842 before him is open to a reasonable doubt. The purpose of this note, however, is to indicate the many instances where he apparently quite lost sight of that calendar if he had one.

Book I opens on a "Saturday afternoon in November," which, we learn in chapter 3, is the fifth of the month.³ The action of the first eight chapters takes place on that day. The next evening (chap. 9) Diggory Venn watches unsuccessfully for a meeting between Eustacia and Wildeve at Rainbarrow. "The same hour the next evening found him again at the same place." We are told that Venn "pursued precisely the same course yet four nights longer, and without success." On the next night, "the day-week of their previous meeting" (i. e., November 12), Eustacia and Wildeve come together; and Venn overhears Wildeve propose that she elope with him to America.

"The next morning," which was Sunday (chap. 10), the reddleman calls upon Eustacia to try to persuade her to give up Wildeve; he is unsuccessful. He then meets Mrs. Yeobright on her way to the Quiet Woman (chap. 11) and offers himself as a possible husband for Thomasin. Using this proposal as a weapon to force Wildeve to a decision, Mrs. Yeobright extracts from him a promise to let her know within a day or two what his intentions are. His exact words are: "I will write to you or call in a day or two" (p. 119).

Mrs. Yeobright's "visit sent Wildeve the same evening after dark to Eustacia's house at Mistover," where he presses her for an answer to his proposal of the day preceding. She pleads for time, but

¹ Carl J. Weber, "Chronology in Hardy's Novels," *PMLA*, LIII (March, 1938), 314.

² P. 320.

³ Thomas Hardy, *The Return of the Native* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1895). All subsequent citations of book and chapter will be made from this edition. Page citations will be made only when they are considered necessary.

promises to give her answer on "Monday week," the day being set by Wildeve (p. 123); and he repeats, when she gives Rainbarrow as the place, "On Monday week at this time I will be at the Barrow." "Monday week" would be, of course, November 21. After the interview with Wildeve, Eustacia goes indoors and is told by her grandfather that Clym Yeobright "is coming home next week to spend Christmas with his mother."

When Book II opens, considerable time has elapsed, "the winter solstice having stealthily come on" (chap. 1). It is, therefore, about December 21 or 22. Eustacia learns by overhearing a conversation between Sam and Humphrey that Clym is "coming across the water to Budmouth by steamer." Evidently Captain Vye's information to Eustacia, on Sunday, November 13, that Clym would be "coming home next week" is false. Is this a slip by Hardy, or did Captain Vye, "grog in hand" at the Quiet Woman, become befuddled?⁴ At any rate, that same December afternoon, after overhearing the conversation, Eustacia walks "in the direction of Blooms-End."

Meanwhile, in chapter 2, Mrs. Yeobright and Thomasin are making preparations for Clym's arrival. During their talk Thomasin says that now she must marry Wildeve for "pride's sake." Mrs. Yeobright's advice is:

"Well, wait till he repeats his offer. I think he may do it, now that he knows—something I told him." . . .

"What did you tell him?"

"That he was standing in the way of another lover of yours." (p. 136)

All this is as if Mrs. Yeobright had seen Wildeve only recently. As a matter of fact, they last met on November 13, it will be recalled, and Wildeve had promised to give his answer in a day or two. As Eustacia is returning toward Mistover she catches a glimpse of Clym on his way home (chap. 3). She dreams of him that night, and awakes the next morning to reflect upon the significance of her vision.

At this point the time indications become rather vague. It is stated that "she took an airing twice or thrice a day upon the Egdon hills." If the five occasions of Eustacia's sallying forth represent the passage of two days, we may date Clym's homecoming December 21, for "the evening of this last day of expectation . . . was the twenty-third of December" (chap. 4).

⁴ Bk. I, chap. 11, p. 124.

This was the evening when the mummers practised at Captain Vye's. To Fairway's question whether they had got all their clothes ready they answer, "We shall by Monday." We learn thereupon that Monday is their "first outing," which is to be at the home of Mrs. Yeobright, who is giving a party, "because 'tis the first Christmas that her son Clym has been home for a long time." On "the next evening," which would be December 24, Charley brings his costume to Eustacia so that she may take his part in the play. "The next evening" (chap. 5) would be Christmas, December 25. It is the night of the play and the party at Mrs. Yeobright's; and, as we have learned, it is a Monday. Be it noted, however, that if November 5 is a Saturday, then Christmas should fall on a Sunday.

A more important error follows in chapter 6. As Eustacia is returning from the party at Blooms-End, she is suddenly reminded by the form of Rainbarrow standing above the hills "of a circumstance which till that moment she had totally forgotten. She had promised to meet Wildeve by the Barrow this very night at eight, to give a final answer to his pleading for an elopement" (p. 178). But as we have seen, the meeting had been arranged for Monday, November 21, and not for Monday, December 25. There is, moreover, an additional error: "She herself had fixed the evening and the hour." Strictly, Wildeve had fixed both, and Eustacia had suggested Rainbarrow as the place.

When Eustacia, "the next morning" (chap. 7), encounters Venn on the heath, Hardy writes: "Wildeve had told her at their last meeting that Venn had been thrust forward by Mrs. Yeobright as one ready and anxious to take his place as Thomasin's betrothed" (pp. 181-2). As a matter of fact, Wildeve had done nothing of the sort, and Mrs. Yeobright, for obvious reasons, was careful to withhold the name of Thomasin's suitor. Indeed, Wildeve had asked Mrs. Yeobright to name the new suitor, but she had declined to do so.⁵ When Wildeve met Eustacia that evening (November 13) he had only this to say concerning Thomasin's unknown admirer: "She (Mrs. Yeobright) only says she wishes me to give up Thomasin because another man is anxious to marry her."⁶ But by the night of December 26 Wildeve has somehow discovered whom Mrs. Yeobright meant, for he tells Venn: "Mrs. Yeobright says you are to marry her" (p. 188).

⁵ I, 11, 118.

⁶ P. 121.

Have Mrs. Yeobright and Wildev, Wildev and Eustacia, met since that Sunday of November 13? If they have, Hardy has scarcely played cricket with his readers. Indeed, any supposition that these meetings might have taken place during the "lost" days between November 13 and December 21 is extremely weak, for the structure of the novel indicates that Hardy had intended to be careful of such details.

"On that evening (i. e., December 26) the interior of Blooms-End . . . had been rather silent" (chap. 8). Clym "had gone on a few days' visit to a friend about ten miles off." Inasmuch as the Christmas party had taken place the night before, he had probably left home only that morning. Nevertheless, Mrs. Yeobright has not only received a letter from him, but has read it "for the tenth time that day"; Clym has not only heard of Thomasin's predicament, but has had time to "contradict the tale everywhere"—all this in the space of a day. On this same evening, after Wildev's dash to claim Thomasin, she tells Mrs. Yeobright that "he would like the wedding to be day after to-morrow." "The next day (i. e., December 27) was passed in mere mechanical deeds of preparation" for the wedding. "The appointed morning (i. e., December 28) came." Thomasin goes off to be married to Wildev, and Clym returns from his "few days' visit" that lasted from the twenty-sixth to the morning of the twenty-eighth.

The next inconsistency does not occur until the summer has arrived. On June 25 Clym and Eustacia are married.⁷ We are told, in chapter 1 of book IV, that "about six weeks after their union" (i. e., about August 6), Mrs. Yeobright visits Eustacia to inquire after the missing guineas. "Next day (chap. 2) the mystery of the guineas was explained." After this Clym "read far into the small hours during many nights." The result was an affliction of the eyes, and it was not until "the third week had arrived, when he went into the open air for the first time since the attack."

One would suspect that at least it is now very near the end of August. "The very next day" Clym procures the necessary equipment with which to cut furze. "Day after day he rose with the sun" to labor on the heath. Surely, now it must be September, but Hardy evidently hasn't bothered to count the days. "A few days later, before the month of August had expired" (chap. 3)

⁷ Cf. Bk. III, chap. 6, pp. 258, 260 and chap. 7, p. 267.

Eustacia attends the village festival at East Egdon. Her return in the company of Wildeve is observed by Diggory Venn; and "on the night after the festival" (chap. 4) Venn trails Wildeve to Alderworth. "A night or two later" Wildeve again goes to Alderworth; again he is trailed by Venn. That same night the latter calls upon Mrs. Yeobright to persuade her to visit Clym and bring about a reconciliation; this she promises to do; and she goes (chap. 5) on August 31, which is a Thursday, as Hardy correctly mentions. Thus, according to the most conservative estimate, Hardy has packed in more days between June 25 and August 31 than actually exist.

Although from this point Hardy is reasonably accurate in his chronology, a few minor errors might be pointed out. On the night of "Thursday, the thirty-first of August" Mrs. Yeobright dies (chap. 8), after her unsuccessful attempt to see her son. The funeral could hardly have been held before the next day. We are told in chapter 1 of book V that "one evening, about three weeks after the funeral of Mrs. Yeobright," Clym, who apparently has been ill for a considerable length of time, is visited by Thomasin. During the course of their conversation she intimates that her child will arrive "in another month or two." The day of her visit must have been about September 21.

Meanwhile, "Clym's grief" (chap. 2) became mitigated by wearing itself out. His strength returned, and a month after the visit of Thomasin (i. e., about October 21) he might have been seen "walking about the garden." "One evening" news is brought to him of the birth of Thomasin's child. If Hardy's chronology is here to be trusted, then on the fatal night of November 6 the baby is about two weeks old. But on that night Thomasin tells Venn that her baby is "nearly two months old" (chap. 8). If the baby is that old, it was born shortly after September 6, about two weeks before Thomasin tells Clym that she is expecting the baby "in another month or two." Fond parents, even on rainy nights such as November 6 was, do not make such large errors in the age of a baby.

However, to return to chapter 2 of book V, "the morrow came," and "the next day" (i. e., about October 23) Clym encounters Venn, who has been absent from the heath ever since August 31. "I called here (i. e., Blooms-End, to see Mrs. Yeobright) the day

before I left," says Venn. Evidently he has lost track of the days, for upon hearing of Mrs. Yeobright's death, he remarks: "When I parted from her a month ago everything seemed to say that she was going to begin a new life." But even Hardy is momentarily forgetful of the time that has elapsed since the death of Mrs. Yeobright. A few pages later, when Clym is considering whether he should interview Johnny Nunsuch in an attempt to get further particulars concerning his meeting with Mrs. Yeobright on the day she died, Hardy writes: "To probe a child's mind after the lapse of six weeks . . . did not promise much." In reality, almost eight weeks had elapsed. It might be argued, however, that this was Clym's mistake and not Hardy's.

Finally, two inconsistencies in the events that occur on the fatal November 6 should be alluded to. At half-past eleven that night, when Captain Vye puts out his own light (Chap. 7), Eustacia lights the candle in her room (p. 440), preparatory to going out to meet Wildeve. Since Mistover Knap is about one and one-half miles from the Rainbarrow,⁸ it must be nearing twelve when she arrives there. Chapter eight opens with Yeobright sitting "lonely at Blooms-End," while Eustacia "was standing on Rainbarrow." But we learn within a few sentences that "between ten and eleven o'clock . . . he retired to rest, and . . . soon fell asleep." Thomasin awakens him from this sleep "about an hour after" and engages him in talk for perhaps ten minutes when Captain Vye enters (pp. 447-9) and explains that Eustacia had left his house "about half an hour ago." It is thus midnight, about the time, or only a few minutes after, that Eustacia arrived at the Barrow. Obviously, then, Clym cannot be sitting "lonely at Blooms-End," while Eustacia "was standing on Rainbarrow." And upon hearing the news from Captain Vye, Clym immediately departs from the house.

The other inconsistency occurs between the time it takes Thomasin to walk from the Quiet Woman to Blooms-End and the time it takes to return. Between half-past ten and eleven o'clock she begins her journey to Blooms-End.⁹ As we have seen, she arrives there at about ten minutes to twelve, so that her walk takes about an hour or possibly more. She remains in the house after Clym and Captain Vye (it is about midnight) have gone out and leaves approximately

⁸ I, 3, 33.

⁹ Cf. pp. 448-9, 458.

five or ten minutes later (cf. pp. 451-2). About "a quarter past midnight" (chap. 9) Eustacia falls into the stream. While the "hasty actions" (p. 462) of Wildeve and Clym to save Eustacia are in progress, Venn and Thomasin are near enough to see "the removal of the carriage-lamp" and to watch "its motion into the mead." Thomasin's return, therefore, takes about fifteen minutes, about one quarter the time of her expedition to Blooms-End.

Besides the inconsistencies in chronology, this analysis has also pointed out inconsistencies of another kind—incongruities of fact. These errors are scarcely important enough to be regarded as serious blunders—the casual reader would not observe them—but they suggest the possibility that a thorough study of all the Wessex novels would yield results indicating that perhaps too much has been made of Hardy's "blue-print habits."

ALBERT A. MURPHREE
CARL F. STRAUCH

The Johns Hopkins University
Lehigh University

HARDY'S DEBT TO WEBSTER IN *THE RETURN OF THE NATIVE*

John Webster's *The White Devil* is evidently one of "the finer plays of three hundred years ago" which commanded Thomas Hardy's admiration.¹ He owned a set of Hazlitt's edition of Webster's plays (1857); and in volume two, containing *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfi*, his annotations, though they consist simply of pencilled lines in the margin, two corrections in the text, and notes on the relationship of characters in the cast of the second play, indicate that he read with attention.² In connection

¹ "Candour in English Fiction," *New Review*, Jan., 1890; reprinted in *Life and Art: Essays*, collected by E. Brennecke, Jr. (New York, 1925), p. 77.

² For this information I am indebted to Lieut.-Col. Charles D. Drew, curator and secretary of the Dorset County Museum, where, in the Hardy Memorial Collection, Hardy's set is now preserved. Hardy marked none of the passages referred to in this paper. Because Hazlitt's edition is the one he knew, I use it, unless otherwise stated, rather than that of F. L. Lucas (Oxford, 1937), and refer to passages by page and line (in Lucas,

with Hardy, Webster has been mentioned only in general discussions of tragedy and of Hardy's affinity with the great Elizabethans. Henry C. Duffin in his study of Hardy says that aside from Shakespeare, only two writers have been able to achieve scenes of inevitable, terrible verisimilitude: these scenes are to be found "in Webster occasionally, and in Hardy with some frequency."³ He names among other scenes the quarrel between Clym and Eustacia in *The Return of the Native* (Book V, Chap. 3), and finds that "in its agony, its mutual misunderstanding, its passionate grief and regret, its tremendous anger, it is profoundly reminiscent of some of the scenes between Othello and Desdemona, especially of that in Act IV, Scene 2."⁴ I wish to show that this scene was inspired directly by Webster: the quarrel between Brachiano and Vittoria (*W. D.* iv, ii) is also "one of the greatest of all scenes of combat between man and woman."⁵

The imitative passages, quoted in parallel for convenience, should be read in their context, since much has been omitted from each scene and the sequence of quotations from Webster disarranged.

by act, scene and line). The texts of passages quoted differ widely in spelling, line-arrangement, and scene-division, but little in sense. References to *The Return of the Native* (1878) are made to Harper's Anniversary Edition. I regret that I have been unable to consult the MS: the many published texts show careful progressive revision.

³ *Thomas Hardy: A Study of the Wessex Novels, the Poems, and "The Dynasts,"* 3rd ed. (Manchester, 1937), p. 104.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 107. This judgment is supported by Carl J. Weber in "Thomas Hardy: Twin-Voice of Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* IX (Apr., 1934), 97. That Mr. Duffin is also reminded of the scene between Melantius and Evadne in Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Maid's Tragedy* is interesting because apparently both Webster and Hardy knew the play. Cf. (in Lucas's ed.) *W. D.*, iv, ii, 43-45 with *M. T.* (Cambridge ed., vol. I) II, p. 22. In *Far From the Madding Crowd* (1874; Anniversary ed., p. 352), gloomy Bathsheba calls for Beaumont and Fletcher's play. But there is no more direct influence from it than from *Othello* in Hardy's scene.

⁵ *Ibid.* Possible influence of *The Duchess of Malfi* on the same novel may be noted: cf. the idea in Bk. V, Chap. 2, pp. 379-380 with iv, ii, 237, 21-24; the situation in Bk. I, Chap. 6, pp. 70-71 with I, ii, 175-177 (Lucas, I, i, 406 ff.); the impression made upon the reader by Bk. IV, Chap. 6, pp. 339-341 with iv, ii, 236-238. I have found no trace of influence from either play on any other of Hardy's works except perhaps two poems in *Human Shows* (1925) reminiscent of situations in *D. M.*: cf. the first three stanzas of "A Poor Man and a Lady" with I, ii, 173-178 (Lucas, I, i, 406 ff.); and "The Echo Elf Answers" with v, iii.

'Clym,' she answered slowly, 'do you think you dare do anything to me that I dare not bear (387)?'

[Eustacia:] 'Poor charity (388).'

[Clym:] * 'How often does he write to you? Where does he put his letters—when does he meet you? Ah, his letters!' . . . 'Come, come! stand away! I must see them (388-389).'

[Clym breaks open her desk and finds an empty envelope in Wildeve's handwriting.]

'Can you read, madam? Look at this envelope. Doubtless we shall find more soon, and what was inside them. I shall no doubt be gratified by learning in good time what a well-finished and full-blown adept in a certain trade my lady is.'

'Do you say it to me—do you?' she gasped (389).

'What was in this letter?' he said.

'Ask the writer. Am I your hound that you should talk to me in this way?'

'Do you brave me? do you stand me out, mistress? Answer (389).'

[Clym, of Mrs. Yeobright:] 'Call her to mind—think of her—what goodness there was in her: it showed in every line of her face (390)!'

[Eustacia:] 'I have lost all through you, but I have not complained. Your blunders and misfortunes may have been a sorrow to you, but they have been a wrong to me. All persons of refinement have been scared

[Vit.] What dar'st thou do, that I not dare to suffer, . . . (87, 14)?

Vit. O poor charity (III, ii, 57, 8)!

[Brach.] Come, come, let's see your cabinet, discover
Your treasury of love-letters.
Death and furies!
I'll see them all (84, 16-18).

Brach.⁷ Can you read, mistress?
look upon that letter:
There are no characters, nor
hieroglyphics.
You need no comment; I am grown
your receiver.
God's precious! you shall be a
brave great lady,
A stately and advanced whore.
Vit. Say, sir (84, 10-15)?

Flam. . . . am I your dog?

Brach. A blood-hound: do you
brave, do you stand me (82, 25-26)? *

Brach. [of Isabella] O my sweetest
duchess,
How lovely art thou now (85, 18-19)!

Vit. What have I gain'd by thee,
but infamy?
Thou hast stain'd the spotless honour
of my house,
And frighted thence noble society:
. . .

* Clym has no knowledge of letters from a lover of Eustacia; Brachiano holds in his hand a letter which Francisco had intended him to intercept.

⁷ This passage opens IV, ii in Hazlitt; in Lucas, it is lines 73 ff.

* Hazlitt, IV, i; Lucas, IV, ii, 51-53.

away from me since I sank into the mire of marriage. Is this your cherishing—to put me into a hut like this, and keep me like the wife of a hind? You deceived me—not by words, but by appearances, which are less seen through than words. But the place will serve as well as any other—as somewhere to pass from—into my grave.’ Her words were smothered in her throat, and her head drooped down.

‘I don’t know what you mean by that. Am I the cause of your sin?’ (Eustacia made a trembling motion towards him.) ‘What, you can begin to shed tears and offer me your hand? Good God! can you? No, not I. I’ll not commit the fault of taking that.’ (The hand she had offered dropped nervelessly, but the tears continued flowing.) ‘Well, yes, I’ll take it, if only for the sake of my own foolish kisses that were wasted there before I knew what I cherished. How bewitched I was!’⁹ How could there be any good in a woman that everybody spoke ill of (391)?’
[Eustacia:] ‘Best natures commit bad faults sometimes, don’t they (392)?’

These parallels show that Hardy has rearranged and adapted several parts of Webster’s scene; they do not show the most important fact, which an independent reading of each scene in its entirety will reveal: Hardy’s expansion and complete transmutation of his material into a passage natural to his characters, appropriate

. . . What do you call this house?
Is this your palace? did not the
judge style it
A house of penitent whores? who
sent me to it? . . .

. . . go, go, brag
How many ladies you have undone
like me . . .

. . . I do wish
That I could make you full executor
To all my sins. O that I could toss
myself

Into a grave as quickly! For all
thou’rt worth

I’ll not shed one tear more—I’ll
burst first (86, 3-5, 8-10, 13-14,
19-23).

Flam. Pander! Am I the author
of your sin (87, 5)?

Brach. What! dost weep?
Procure but ten of thy dissembling
trade,
Ye’d furnish all the Irish funerals
With howling past wild Irish. . . .
That hand, that cursed hand, which
I have wearied
With doating kisses! . . .

. . . I was bewitch’d;
For all the world speaks ill of thee
(85, 12-15, 17-18, 20-21).

[*Flam.*] Best natures do commit
the grossest faults, . . . (88, 21).

⁹ Cf. “‘Don’t look at me with those eyes as if you would bewitch me again (389)!’” and “‘You have held my happiness in the hollow of your hand, and like a devil you have dashed it down (386)!’”

to his needs, characteristic of his temper. The differences are as important as the similarities, and both Webster and Hardy profit by their literary relationship.

MARCIA LEE ANDERSON

Duke University

HILDEBRANDSLIED 20-22a.

Interpreters of HL 20-22a¹

her furlaet in lante lutila sitten
prut in bure barn unwahsan
arbo laosa

have busied themselves mainly with problems of manuscript readings, language, and metrics, and only to a limited extent with such legal questions as are suggested by this situation: A man follows his lord into exile. What happens to his wife, his issue, his property?² The reason for this seems to be that some commentators have tried to explain the HL from the manuscript text, without the "outside help" of historical sources or of parallel sagas or of kindred motifs.³ Thus Elis Wadstein wrote, in 1903, at the end of

¹ See W. Braune, *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch*⁸ (Halle, 1921), pp. 180 ff. and p. 184 for lines 20-22a; *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch*⁹ (Halle, 1928), pp. 186 ff. and pp. 189 f. for lines 20-22a.

² There are, to be sure, attempts at juridical interpretations of the whole of the HL. G. Ehrismann, e.g., claims for the second half of the dialogue the structure of Germanic legal procedure in *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters, Erster Teil* (München, 1932), p. 130 with note 1. And Paul Punschart, "Zur rechtsgeschichtlichen Auslegung des Hildebrandsliedes," *Festschrift zu Ehren Emil von Otten-thals* (Innsbruck, 1925), pp. 170 ff., says: Zu den Problemen der Dichtung (HL) zählt auch ihre Beziehung zum Recht (p. 171). He confines himself, however, in this brilliant article chiefly to the establishment of a new, legal interpretation of the form "wettu" in line 30: pledging, offering as security, mortgaging his flesh and blood, the father takes upon himself a legal obligation and becomes a hostage.

³ Interesting in this connection are the various translations made from time to time. E.g., according to Lachmann, Hildebrand leaves behind three: Er verliesz im Lande elend sitzen Die Frau im Hause, unerwachsenes Kind, Erblös (er ritt gen Osten fort) das Volk [cited from O. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte der Kritik und Erklärung des Hildebrandsliedes*. Gymnasialprogramm Naumburg a. S., 1876, pp. 9 and 11]; according to Gering,

the introduction to his "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Hildebrandsliedes":

Mein erster grundsatz wird der sein, mich so genau wie möglich an den überlieferten text des liedes zu halten und denselben in ungesuchter weise—ohne mich von anderen sagen- oder geschichtsquellen beeinflussen zu lassen—zu erklären und zu übersetzen.⁴

But even the systematic and painstaking study of "outside material" such as represented e. g. by B. Busse, "Sagengeschichtliches zum Hildebrandslied," *Paul-Braune Beiträge*, xxvi (1901), 1-92, and by G. Ehrismann, "Zum Hildebrandslied," *Paul-Braune Beiträge*, xxxii (1907), 260-92, apparently has shed no light on the legal problem in lines 20-22a, except in the case of Franz Saran's investigation of the HL. in 1915, Saran complains that the interest in the purely philological aspects of the HL. and the interest in the story material ("Stoff") have prevented the literary historian from doing his real task in connection with the HL, viz. that of working up the thought content of the poem and of assigning the poem its proper place in the spiritual and intellectual movements of the last decade of the eighth century A. D.⁵ Yet in spite of his invective against the emphasis placed on what he calls minor aspects of the HL, Saran refers to the author of the HL as constantly alluding to Frankish-feudal conditions and as being in all likelihood one of the educated contemporaries of Charles the Great.⁶ And thus it is Saran who, in my opinion, has made in spite of himself the only worthwhile contribution "from the outside" to our passage when he calls attention to the distichs which Paulus Diaconus penned in 782 A. D. (at about the time when the Hildebrandslied was written down) and which he submitted to Charles the Great in order to

Hildebrand leaves behind *two*: Er liesz im Lande elend zurück die Frau im Hause, das Kind unerwachsen, das erblose [*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* xxvi (1894), p. 465]; according to Kluge, Hildebrand leaves behind *one*: Er liesz daheim bei der Hausfrau den kindjungen Knaben arm an Erbgütern [F. Kluge, *Hildebrandslied, Ludwigslid und Merseburger Zaubersprüche*. Deutschkundliche Bücherei (Leipzig, 1919), p. 63; cf. p. 21].

⁴ Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift ix (1903), no. 4, p. 3.

⁵ Franz Saran, *Das Hildebrandslied*. "Bausteine zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur," ed. Franz Saran, xv (Halle a. S., 1915), pp. 2 and 163.

⁶ Saran, *o. c.*, pp. 185 (top) and 164 (bottom); cf. G. Neckel in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* xxxvii (1916), coll. 1842-3.

arouse the king's mercy for his exiled brother Arichis.⁷ In this poem, Paul the Deacon describes the piteous estate of the wife and children and sister of the man in exile:

- 9 Illius in patria coniunx miseranda per omnes
- 10 Mendicat plateas ore tremante cibos.
- 11 Quattuor hac turpi natos sustentat ab arte,
- 12 Quos vix pannuciis praevallet illa tegi.
- 13 Est mihi, quae primis Christo sacrata sub annis
- 14 Excubat, egregia simplicitate soror:
- 15 Haec sub sorte pari luctum sine fine retentans
- 16 Privata est oculis iam prope flendo suis.
- 17 Quantulacunque fuit, direpta est nostra supellex,
- 18 Nec est, heu, miseris qui ferat ullus opem.

⁷ Saran, *o. c.*, p. 141.—Prior to Saran, Ehrismann had in *Paul-Braune Beiträge* xxxii (1907), p. 279, cited for line 20 no. 8 of the Salomon Formulae, claiming that this formula furnishes specific directions, valid for such cases as the one under discussion. In my opinion, the wording of no. 8 renders it inapplicable to our situation. The Salomon Formulae are published in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Legum Sectio V. Formulae, I. Formulae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi* (ed. K. Zeumer [Hanover, 1886]), pp. 390 ff. There they appear together as "Collectio Sangallensis Salomonis III. tempore conscripta." No. 8, on pp. 401-2, bears the title: "karta illius, qui, in bellum profecturus vel ubicumque, matrem cum uxore, cum filio vel filia parvula reliquerit, et hereditatem suam omnibus cognatis suis acclinem et redemptibilem ad monasterium delegaverit."—The formulae bearing the name of Salomon III may have existed prior to his time (890-920 A.D.); they may have existed at the time when the HL was written down. According to the evidence, they were collected at the time (and probably at the behest) of Salomon III. But no. 8 does not advise a man on his way into exile how to deed his property to one or the other member of his family. The man is on his way to war ("in bellum profecturus"). "Vel ubicumque" must mean "going on a journey to transact business or to make a pilgrimage." In the context it certainly does not mean "going into exile." A portion of formula no. 8 will make this clear: Ego N., incertitudinem huius vitae perpendens, trado ad monasterium Sancti Galli, quicquid proprietatis in Durgewe in illis et in illis N. locis habeo, cui sacratissimo loco reverentissimus abba N. praeesse dinoscitur. Ea tamen ratione res supradictas trado, ut, si, Deo miserante, sanus in patriam fuero regressus, quamdiu voluero, sub censu unius denarii possideam, redemptione mihi sub 4 denariis, quandocumque voluero, concessa. Quod si ego illic interfectus vel defunctus fuero, tunc mater mea tertiam partem earundem rerum usque ad diem exitus sui possideat et censum inde ad praefatum monasterium 2 denarios persolvat. Reliquas autem duas partes quondam uxor mea cum parvulo filio, vel filia mea, dies vitae suae possideant et tantidem census ad ipsum monasterium reddant. Et si matri

- 19 Coniunx est fratris rebus exclusa paternis,
- 20 Iamque sumus servis rusticitate pares.
- 21 Nobilitas periit miseris, accessit aegestas:
- 22 Debuimus, fateor, asperiora pati.
- 23 Sed miserere, potens rector, miserere, precamur,
- 24 Et tandem finem his pie pone malis.
- 25 Captivum patriae redde et civilibus arvis,
- 26 Cum modicis rebus culmina redde simul;
- 27 Mens nostra ut Christo laudes in secla frequentet,
- 28 Reddere qui solus praemia digna potest.*

As even more pertinent to HL 20-22a than the distichs of Paulus Diaconus I submit two *decreta* which are approximately contemporary with the writing down of the HL. These two *decreta* are the *decretum Compendiense* and the *decretum Vermeriense Pippini*. I have not found them cited in the literature on the HL. This may be due to my admittedly incomplete check of the critical literature. It may be due also to the fact that the two *decreta* were noted, but were not quoted, intentionally, because they were considered irrelevant to the passage under discussion. I do not claim that the two *decreta* change the understanding of HL 20-22a radically. They do show, however, in my opinion, that an ecclesiastic such as the one (or ones) who wrote down the HL could very well have pictured Hildebrand a) as a man who went into exile *without consulting his wife as to whether she wished to join him or not*, or b) as a man *who had asked his wife to join him on his journey into exile and who had received a negative answer*. In other words, the scribe or

meae superstites facti fuerint, et ipsam portionem ad se recipiant et 4 denarios ad monasterium reddant. Quod si idem orphanus meus ad virilem pervenerit aetatem et legitimam duxerit uxorem,—Quod si eadem orphana mea ad nubilem pervenerit aetatem et legitimo viro nupserit, licentiam habeat uno solido redimendi. Si autem ille ante obierit, fratres mei eo pacto easdem possessiones redimere debeant, si ipso orphano meo, dum adhuc viveret, omnem humanitatem et dilectionem exhibuerunt; et uterque eorum una libra argenti redimant . . . — Formula no. 8 deals with the exigencies that may arise when a man in full possession of his civil rights disposes of his real estate. Hence, I repeat, the Salomon Formula no. 8 is not applicable to HL 20, where, to say the least, Hildebrand's full possession of civil rights is certainly very much in doubt.

* *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Poetarum Latinorum Medii Aevi Tomi I Pars Prior* (Berlin, 1880) no. x of the poems by Paulus Diaconus, pp. 47-8; cf. p. 28.

scribes at the end of the eighth century might very well have asked the question: does "furlaet" mean *dimisit* or does it mean *reliquit*?

Assuming the possibility of these two technical, legal meanings of "furlaet," I am, of course, forced to accept Lachmann's explanation of "prut" as accusative singular: *dimisit* or *reliquit uxorem* or *novam nuptam*. And I must reject Holtzmann's emendation according to which "prut" stands for "pruti" (genetive singular). Since it is evident to me that young Hadubrand does not wish to censure his presumably dead father as one who has left his wife and small child to a cruel fate at the hands of a hostile prince, I translate "furlaet" by *reliquit*, i. e. Hildebrand asked his wife to join him on his journey into exile, but he received a negative answer. The reason for her negative answer may easily be divined: it was the small child, too small to be taken along on the flight to the East Country. Such a reason is certainly not less potent, if not less valid, than the reasons for not accompanying the husband, given in the *decretum Vermeriense Pippini*.

Situations a) and b) must have arisen not altogether infrequently. Else the two *decreta* would not have been formulated. The fact that the two *decreta* deal with divorce and remarriage and only incidentally with exile and property disposal render them not less pertinent in my opinion.

The *decretum Compendiense* is dated 757 A. D. and the *decretum Vermeriense Pippini* a little later. They are most easily accessible in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Legum Sectio II. Capitularia Regum Francorum I* (ed. A. Boretius [Hanover, 1883]), pp. 39 and 41 respectively.

The pertinent sections follow:

Cap. Compendiense c. 21: si qui propter faidam fugiunt in alias patrias et dimittunt uxores suas, nec illi viri nec illae feminae accipiant coniugium.⁹

Cap. Vermeriense c. 9: si quis necessitate inevitabili cogente in alium ducatum seu provinciam fugerit aut seniore suum, cui fidem mentiri non potuerit, secutus fuerit, et uxor eius, cum valet et potest, amore parentum aut suis rebus eum sequi noluerit, ipsa omni tempore, qamdiu vir eius quem secuta non fuit vivet, semper innupta

⁹ Cf. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Legum I* (ed. G. H. Pertz [Hanover, 1835]), pp. 27-9. c. 21 is on p. 29. Here is added, as *varia lectio*, to c. 21: Georgius consentit.

permaneant. Nam ille vir eius, qui necessitate cogente in alium locum fugit, si se abstinere non potest, aliam uxorem cum poenitentia potest accipere.¹⁰

JOHN G. KUNSTMANN

The University of Chicago

OLD FRENCH *BELLURÉ*

Old French *belluré* is listed as a *hapax* in the dictionary of Tobler-Lommatzsch¹ which merely cites its occurrence in *Li Vers de la Mort* (stanza 52, 11) and offers no translation or explanation:

Uns jours venra, dont peu curés,
Qui a tous ert si *bellurés*,
N'arés parent qui ne vous laie.

The word in this passage had been previously noted as a *hapax* by Godefroy (*Dict.* I, 618 b), who says of it: "employé pour signifier au sujet duquel on est trompé; imprévu."

Here is a second example of *belluré*, also in rhyme, unknown to Godefroy and Tobler-Lommatzsch. It appears in a manuscript² of the *fabliau Del Sot chevalier* which was not utilized by Montaiglon and Raynaud³ in their edition:

245. Puis a les deus traus mesurés.
Il ne fu mie *bellurés*
Qu'il n'ait tant contre mont erciet
Qu'il a au plus lone aderciet.

¹⁰ See also *decretum Compendiense* c. 9 and cf. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Legum* I, p. 23, where the last sentence reads: nam ille vir eius, qui necessitate cogente in alium locum fugit [si numquam in suam patriam se reversurum sperat], si se abstinere non potest etc.—For the relationship existing between the *decretum Compendiense* and the *decretum Vermeriense* and the ecclesiastical aspects of regulation of divorce and remarriage etc. see Heinrich Mitteis, *Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt. Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Weimar, 1933), p. 44.

¹ *Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch*, Berlin, 1925, I, 913 a.

² Cf. *Report of the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire* (Historical Manuscripts Commission), Hereford, 1911, folio 342 verso b of the ms. described on p. 233 f.

³ *Recueil général des fabliaux*, Paris, 1872, I, 220 f.

The passage in the text of Montaiglon et Raynaud which corresponds to these verses reads as follows:

243. Puis a les .||. traus mesurez;
Il ne fu mie si dervez
Que tant ne l'ait traite et tracie
Qu'il a la piaucele percie;

Verses 246-248 of the unpublished version develop more naturally the sense of the common verse: *Puis a les .||. traus mesurés*, than do verses 244-246 of the printed text, and verse 248 of the former offers a sequence to it. The published text seems like an awkward adaptation of the other to avoid such rare or dialectal words as *bellurés*, *erciet* and *aderciet*. Besides, *bellurés* satisfies the rich rhyme which is a decided feature of the poems of Gautier Le Leu, author of the *fabliau*.⁴ It seems certain that it was a part of the original.

Windahl in the glossary to his edition of *Li Vers de la Mort*⁵ explains *bellurés*: "part. pass. 52, 11. Je pense que c'est le pc. du verbe *belluer*, *belliver*." This is followed by a (T) which evidently means that Tobler shares his opinion, for he says in his introduction that Tobler has helped him with his difficulties in the text. It is curious to note that *belluer* and *belliver* are here considered to be one and the same verb. They are listed in the dictionaries of Godefroy and Tobler-Lommatzsch as two different verbs, and this seems to be logical, for *belluer* (*besluer* < **bislucare*), *verblenden*, *falsch sehen* (Tob.-Lom.), which is transitive in the two known cases, is to be related to *bellue*, *berlue* (**bisluca*),⁶ whereas *belliver*, *besliver*: *schräg laufen* (Tob.-Lom.), which is always intransitive, is to be derived from L. *obliquare* with prefix substitution *bis-* for *ob-*,⁷ or is constructed upon *beslif*.⁸

From the semantic point of view *belluré*, taken as past participle

⁴ Cf. *RE*, xv (1924), 20.

⁵ Lund, 1887, p. 138.

⁶ W. Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Etym. Wörterb.* 3d ed., no. 1127; and G. Tilander, *Dérivés méconnus du latin lux, lucem*, in *Minneskrift uthiven av Filologisk Samfundet*, Göteborg, 1925, 160 and 161. Tilander supposes the existence of a *berluer* < **bislucare* without identifying it with *belluer*, *besluer*, as we have.

⁷ Meyer-Lübke, *op. cit.*, no. 6013.

⁸ G. Tilander, *Notes étymologiques* in *Mélanges A. Thomas*, Paris, 1927, 466.

or participial adjective, equivalent to *beslivé*, fits our passages perfectly. So interpreted, verses 246 f. of the *fabliau* would mean: "he did not at all go *crooked* (*bellurés*), but on the contrary went upwards in such a way that he attained the longest hole." The passage of *Li Vers de la Mort* could be translated: "A day will come which will be so *critical* or *dangerous* (*bellurés*) that you will have no relative who will not abandon you." It is true that here we have given to *bellurés* (*beslivés*) a figurative sense: *critical* or *dangerous*, but the use of *belif* in the following passage from the *Roman des romans*⁹ justifies such an interpretation:

Ha las! dolent tant par eimes chaitif,
Quant nostre vie vëons en tel *belif*!¹⁰
Ja l'endemain n'en serrons plus pensif.

An explanation of the form *belluré* (= *beslivé*) is suggested if we examine *delurer*¹¹ a rare variant of *delivrer*. Verbs of which the first syllable is *bes* usually have simple forms: *bes-tondre*, *bes-torner*, *bes-cuire*, *bes-jugier*, *bes-order*, *bes-tencier*, *bes-tordre* (cf. also *besillier*, *essillier*; *bescochier*, *descochier*), but there was no simplex *liver* (*bes-liver*), nor was there a compound *beslivrer* (*bes* + *livrer*). *Besliver* may then have been popularly construed to be a compound of *livrer*. This analogical form **beslivrer* (= *besliver*) could well have had a dialectal or popular variant *beslurer* (*bellurer*), just as *delivrer* had such a variant *delurer*, and this would explain the past participle or participial adjective *belluré* of our texts.¹²

Delurer (*delivrer*) seems to show the passing of the labial ele-

⁹ Ed. Tanquerey, Paris, 1922, v. 239 f. (cited by Tob.-Lom.)

¹⁰ Tob.-Lom. I, 941 b, explains *belif* in this passage as: *fig. Gefahr.*; Godefroy interprets it (I, 616 b) as *situation critique*. *Belif* (*beslif*) used with prepositions *de*, *a en* has the literal sense: *schräg*, *de biais*, *de travers*.

¹¹ In a ms. of the *Roman de Renart*; cf. G. Tilander, *Notes sur le texte du roman de Renart*, *Zeits. f. rom. phil.*, XLIV, 681.

¹² Analogies of this sort give rise to a bewildering number of variants in the verb system of Old French, especially in the dialects: *giembre*, *geindre*; *escrire*, *escrire*; *beivre*, *boire*, etc. *L. tremere* is represented in the old language by *criembre*, *criendre*, *craindre*, *cremer*, *cremir*, *cremoir*; cf. past participles in *-ectus* on the pattern of *collectus colloit*; dialectal infinitives such as *cheïr*, *veïr*, *seïr* in the east and northeast; dialectal forms of *pooir*: *poulons*, *poulez*, *puelent*; etc., etc. Verbs in *-iver* and *-ivrer* are both rare but *livrer*, *delivrer* are of very frequent occurrence.

ment in *vr* over into the rounding of the vowel *i* > *u*. This phenomenon is common from early times in Anglo-Norman,¹³ and was not unknown on the continent,¹⁴ but in both cases appears more frequently after back vowels, although is not limited to this position. This feature is difficult of demonstration because of the unique sign *u* for *u* and *v* in medieval mss., the influence of the literary language, and in the case of *-ivr-* > *-ur-*, because of the rarity of words in rhyme containing it.

In any case, to sum up, the existence of a second example of *bellurés* in the *fabliau* confirms the *bellurés* of *Li Vers de la Mort*. They are, we believe, dialectal or popular forms of *bellivés* (*beslivés*) with which they concur in sense. The two texts in which *bellurés* is established by rich rhyme, were written in the 13th century, *Li Vers de la Mort* in the Artois, the *fabliau* in Hainaut.

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Bowdoin College

¹³ Cf. the forms of the Oxford ms. of the *Chanson de Roland*: *jo muvra* 311, *jo murra* 1867. Stimming, *Der Anglonormannische Boeve de Haumtone* (*Bibliotheca Normannica* VII), Halle, 1899, 219, gives many examples. The phenomenon is not restricted to *vr* > *ur* after back vowels: cf. *eschure* = *eschivre* in a *fabliau* in Anglo-Norman. (Mont. et Rayn., *op. cit.*, II, 226).

¹⁴ The phenomenon is not studied in the grammars. A. T. Baker, *Romania*, LXIII (1937), 1 f., shows with considerable probability that *aurai*, *saurai* are very old forms. Cf. Mont et Rayn., *op. cit.*, II, 211, 425-426: *euvre*: *mure* (= *meuvre*) from a Walloon ms.; Baudoin de Condé (ed. Scheler), I, 428: *deseure* (= *desevre*): *deseure* (adv.). That the *v* was at least weak in this position (*-vr-*) in some regions of the northeast, appears from such scribal notations as *enquerre*: *oeuvre* (Gilles Li Muisis, ed. K. de Littenhove, I, 37, 33) and *oeuvre*: *noire* (Mont. et Rayn., *op. cit.*, II, 202, 151-152); cf. also *estera* = *estevra* (*Li Regres Nostre Dame*, ed. Langfors, p. 103) and *estora*, *estera* (Wace), *estouira* (*Partonopeus*) where *oui* is one syllable—all cited by Godefroy (*estovoir*). Tilander, *Zeits. f. rom. phil.*, XLIV, 678, notes a number of rhymes in a ms. of the *Renart* where *v* in *-vr-* has no value for the rhyme. The modern patois know this transformation of the *v*, after front and back vowels: cf. *loure*, *lovre* (*lucubra*) in the east (Horning in *Zeits. f. rom. phil.*, XVIII, 213; *Romania*, XXIX, 119); *deseurer* (*desevrer*) in Picardy (Godefroy, II, 655 a).

THE IDENTITY OF 'M. T. COYFURELLE'

'M. T. Coyfurelly' has long been a mystery. He is known to have been the author or editor of a *Tractatus orthographie gallicane*, of which there are two extant copies, both in England.¹ Attention was attracted to him in 1878 and 1879, when E. Stengel published two articles² identifying him as the author of *La manière de langage qui t'enseignera bien et droit parler et escrire doulz françois*. One copy³ of this work had been recognized and studied by Paul Meyer in 1870.⁴ The second copy⁵ was found by Stengel and resulted in his assignment of the authorship to 'M. T. Coyfurelly,' concerning whom he was able to learn nothing new.⁶ The British Museum authorities have no further information. There is a date, 1396, on the British Museum manuscript,⁷ but it is that of a copy made at Bury-St. Edmund's in that year, by a copyist whose name appears on the same page. The question came up again in 1926, when Royster pointed out that the *Manière de langage* mentioned Chaucer's famous magician, 'Colle Tregetour' and the practice of the Black Art in Orléans at the end of the fourteenth century.⁸

As far as I have been able to discover, there is no conclusive proof that 'Coyfurelly' wrote the *Manière de langage*, but neither is there any proof of the contrary, and Stengel's case for him is a very strong one. One of his arguments is that internal evidence shows the author to have been completely familiar with Orléans and its

¹ British Museum, *M. S. Harl.* 4971; Oxford, Magdalen College *MS.* 188.

² 'The earliest French grammars,' *Athenaeum*, no. 2658 (1878), 433; 'Die ältesten Anleitungsschriften zur Erlernung der französischen Sprache . . .,' *ZNSL*, 1 (1879), 1 ff.

³ British Museum, *MS. Harl.* 3988, fol. 1-26r.

⁴ *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*, 5ème année, 2ème semestre (1870, extra number, appeared 1873), 373 ff.

⁵ Oxford, All Souls College *MS.* 182, fol. 305-316; 372v-373v. My attention has just been called to an unpublished thesis in the University of London, Jennifer Nicholson, *A contribution to the study of French as taught in England, XIIIth-XVth centuries*, which was abstracted for me by Miss Muriel Campbell, with kind permission of the author and of the director of the Library. Miss Nicholson has seen four additional copies, not all complete: British Museum *MS Additional* 17716, fol. 106r-111v; Cambridge University Library *MS Dd* 1223, 70v-74v; Bibliothèque Nationale *MS Nouv. Acq. Fran.* 699; Cambridge, Trinity College Library, *MS B* 13. 40, fol. 179r-v.

⁶ *ZNSL*, 1, 23.

⁷ *MS. Harl.* 3988.70a.

⁸ J. F. Royster, 'Colle Tregetour,' *SP*, xxiii (1926), 380 ff.

university,⁹ a fact noted previously by Meyer¹⁰ and later by Royster.¹¹ 'Coyfurelly,' a graduate of the university, and identified as the author by other means, would of course qualify on this point. Can his claim to an Orléans degree and a benefice in Orléans be proven?

There was a person of that name, either a Scot or an Englishman, of whom there are at least six contemporary records, four among the documents of the University of Orléans and two from the Cathedral archives of the city. The initial 'M' is the abbreviation for 'Magister' on the university rolls. The given name is 'Thomas,' and the last name 'Coyfurrel' or 'Coiferrel,' and 'Coyfurelly' or 'Coiferrelli' in the genitive. This name does not appear to be French, and may have been an attempt at a French translation of the English 'Barbour.'

Thomas Coyfurrel was a resident of Orléans at various times, perhaps constantly, between 1393 and 1421. I have been unable to find a record of his arrival, departure, or death. Our first mention of him, in 1393, is on a roll of members of the University of Orléans prepared for Pope Clement VII.¹² These rolls were sent to Rome or Avignon from time to time, but not at regular intervals. They listed professors, students, and servants, and those graduates who lived in or near Orléans and kept up an official connection with the university.¹³ Inscription on such a roll constituted fairly reliable proof of residence in Orléans. Coyfurrel's name appeared on a roll of 1393,¹⁴ and again the following year,¹⁵ both times as a licentiate and graduate. He was not on the last previous roll, sent to the Pope in 1378.¹⁶ There are no other extant rolls among the Vatican records for the possible years of his lifetime.

A similar list was drawn up for the civil authorities in 1412,

⁹ ZNSL, I, 7-8.

¹⁰ *Revue Critique*, op. cit., pp. 377-378.

¹¹ *SP*, xxiii, 380 ff.

¹² Vatican Archives, *Clement VII (antip) Reg. Suppl. an xv*, fol. 186-200. Cf. M. Fournier, *Les statuts des universités françaises . . .*, Paris, 1890-4, III, 467 ff. Another roll of the same year, fol. 200 ff. supplements this.

¹³ Apparently to enjoy the university privilege of tax-exemption for members.

¹⁴ Twentieth among the licentiates. Cf. Fournier, III, 470.

¹⁵ Vatican Archives, *Benedicti XIII (antip) Reg. expectatarum, an. I, pars VI*, fol. 221 ff. Cf. Fournier, III, 474 ff. Coyfurrel is seventeenth of the licentiates. Cf. Fournier, III, 477.

¹⁶ Vatican Archives, *Clement VII (antip) Reg. Suppl. an. I, pars unica*, fol. 109 ff. Cf. Fournier, III, 459 ff.

showing persons who had enjoyed the university privilege of tax-exemption during the year, and what each had imported free of duty.¹⁷ Thomas Coyfurrel was on that list.¹⁸ He had imported eight muids of high quality grain.

In a document of 1421, Coyfurrel's name appears in the *Book of the Scottish Nation at Orléans*.¹⁹ He was among the canons of the Cathedral present at the foundation ceremony of a mass for John Stuart of Darnley, Constable of the Scots Guard in France. The Scottish Nation of the university took an official part in the ceremony, and wrote a complete description of it in a part of their *Liber Nationis* reserved for special entries. The appearance of Coyfurrel's name is not proof of Scottish nationality,²⁰ but suggests it. There were frequently Scottish canons at Orléans, and at least one Scottish bishop.²¹ The evidence in this document proves only that he was beneficed canon of the Cathedral of Sainte Croix of Orléans.²²

A learned librarian of the public library in Orléans has tabulated the names of all canons of Orléans whose names are to be found in several manuscript necrologies of the Cathedral.²³ He gives two

¹⁷ Bibliothèque Nationale (*Collection Bastard d'Estang*, Nouv. acq. fran. 3638, item 129). Cf. J. Loiseleur, 'Les privilèges de l'université de lois d'Orléans,' *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique et Historique de l'Orléanais*, xxii (1889), 21 ff.

¹⁸ Item 73.

¹⁹ *Liber Nationis Scocie*, Vatican Library, *Cod. Reg. Lat. 405*, fol. 11r-12v. Cf. J. Kirkpatrick, 'The Scottish Nation at the University of Orléans, 1336-1538,' *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, II (1904), 74-78, 91-94.

²⁰ Eight canons and two dignitaries attended the ceremony, no nationality being mentioned. Coyfurrel's name does not appear elsewhere in the *Liber Nationis Scocie*. Names of members of the Nation were not usually inscribed unless they represented the Nation at a recorded ceremony, or signed proctor's oaths. There are no extant rolls of members of the Scottish Nation, therefore the absence of a name proves nothing.

²¹ John Carmichael, known in France as Kirkmichel, or Jean de Saint-Michel. Cf. *Gallia Christiana*, vii, 1477.

²² There were ten resident canons and forty-six titular canons at the Cathedral. Cf. A. de Foulques de Villaret, 'Recherches historiques sur l'ancien Chapitre cathédral de l'Eglise d'Orléans . . .,' *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique et Historique de l'Orléanais*, xix (1883), 507.

²³ Ch. Cuissard, 'Les chanoines et dignitaires de la Cathédrale d'Orléans,' *Mémoires de la Société Archéologique et Historique de l'Orléanais*, xxviii (1902), 106 ff. I have not been able to examine these necrologies. Formerly at the Episcopal Palace, they have been removed to the Archives du Loiret at Orléans. I am indebted to M. Jacques Soyer, retired director of the Archives, and the Reverend Georges Chenesseau, Professor of Modern

mentions of Thomas Coyfurrel, one in 1419, and one in 1421. The second may be a Cathedral record of the Darnley foundation. One interesting fact appears in these items, that Coyfurrel was a man of some means, an owner of property in Orléans, for he willed an interest in two houses to the Cathedral, one in the 'vico de la Closerie'²⁴ and the other in the 'vico Parvi Putei.'²⁵

It thus appears that there was a Thomas Coyfurrel, a beneficed canon of the Cathedral of Sainte Croix and a property owner, who was resident in the city of Orléans at least in the years 1393, 1394, 1412, 1419, and 1421.²⁶ His name suggests that he was not French, and the name, as well as the internal evidence in the *Manière*, suggest that he came from an English-speaking country. Stengel and Meyer therefore assumed that he was English.²⁷ It is unlikely that an Englishman would hold a benefice in Orléans in those years of strained relations, and since Scots frequently did hold such benefices, it is quite possible that he was Scottish rather than English. Like the 'M. T. Coyfurelly' author of the *Tractatus*, he was a priest and a Licentiate in Both Laws of the University of Orléans. It is scarcely possible that they are not one and the same person. If they are identical, Stengel's argument that Coyfurrel wrote the *Manière de language* becomes more plausible than ever. Coyfurrel was exactly the type of person Stengel thought he would prove to be, an English-speaking author with an Orléans degree, capable of writing a guide for English-speaking students, and one who was thoroughly familiar with the Orléans scene. Furthermore, his dates make it perfectly possible for him to have written the *Manière de language* in time for a copy to have been made at Bury in 1396.²⁸

Duke University

DOROTHY MACKAY QUINN

History at the Institut Catholique of Paris, for valuable notes corroborating Cuissard's work.

²⁴ Perhaps the Rue du Cloître Sainte Croix, still in existence. It was then within the Cathedral Close, and may have been Coyfurrel's residence as a canon.

²⁵ The Rue du Petit Puits, still in existence.

²⁶ Monsieur Soyer, who has examined the necrologies, says that neither his appointment nor his death are recorded by date.

²⁷ *ZNSL*, I, 10; *Revue Critique*, *op. cit.*, 373-374, 378.

²⁸ The material in this paper is part of a study of the history of the University of Orléans. The writer is grateful to the American Association of University Women for a Fellowship, and to the American Council of Learned Societies and the Duke University Research Council for grants-in-aid, which made the research possible.

LA GALA DEL NADAR—DATE AND AUTHORSHIP¹

La gala del nadar es saber guardar la ropa was published in 1672 under Moreto's name,² but there is every reason to think that it was written before 1628 and every reason to doubt that Moreto ever put pen to it. Some years ago I questioned³ its attribution to him, pointing out that its characteristics were those of the late Lopean period; but as I could not support the theory with external evidence nor adduce other critical authority to support my opinion, I did not definitely remove the play from his theatre.

La gala del nadar is mentioned in at least two of Calderón's works: *El alcalde de Zalamea* and *Luis Pérez el gallego*. Neither of these plays was published until 1651,⁴ but the latter was written by December 21st, 1628, for at that date it was represented by Antonio de Prado.⁵ In the former play one finds the following lines (II, xxiii, 79):

Rebolledo: Ten esas capas.
Chispa: Que es del reñir, imagino,
 la gala al guardar la ropa,
 aunque del nadar se dijo.

Rebolledo, foreseeing a fight, gives his cape in safekeeping in circumstances that are not unlike those which lead Rugero to protect his clothes.⁶ In *Luis Pérez el gallego*, the idea becomes less literal, less tentative, and more cumulative (III, ii, 455):

¹ A fellowship from the A. A. U. W. in 1937-38 made possible this note.

² *Escogidas*, Parte xxxviii, Madrid, Lucas Antonio de Bedmar. It has never been reprinted.

³ *Dramatic Art of Moreto*, Northampton, Mass., 1931-32, p. 147.

⁴ *El mejor de los mejores libros*, Alcalá. *El alcalde de Zalamea* there has the name of *El garrote más bien dado*. References in this study are to the respective BAE. editions, XII, IX.

⁵ See H. Rennert, "Notes on the Chronology of the Spanish Drama," *MLR.*, III (1907-1908), 45. The date of *El alcalde* is uncertain, but I suspect it to have been written about the same time. Both are characterised by youthful pugnacity, and both are in the Lopean tradition rather than the manner that was to distinguish Calderón's later plays. However, *El alcalde* has usually been assigned to the early 1640's.

⁶ When Ricardo invites Rugero to go swimming in Fontainebleau with the intention of having him drowned, the latter, warned of his treachery, appears with his fiancée and several men who are placed there ostensibly to "guard his cape and sword."

. . . del nadar y el reñir
 el guardar la ropa fué
 la gala.

It might be argued that both of these references could be to a popular proverb of the day, but given the similarity of its setting in this play and Calderón's, together with the fact that one does not find it in Covarrubias or Correas, that seems hardly probable. The *refrán* would seem to have originated with this play. In the *Diccionario de la lengua* (1739) under *gala* one finds: "La gala del nadar es saber guardar la ropa. Refrán con que se significa que en qualquier cosa o negocio lo más preciso es atender a no padecer algún daño u detrimento." This, both in form and idea, tallies perfectly with the play under discussion.

There is still further reason to think this play was written in the twenties, probably the very early twenties or even during the last half of the second decade. It was, in my opinion, done at a time when the Spanish and French courts had an interest in each other and were even determined to like one other. This was the situation in the last days of Philip III's and the first years of Philip IV's reign when by a double wedding Spain acquired a French queen and France a Spanish one. When the curtain goes up, Flora, the heroine, is in the country near Fontainebleau awaiting the return of the count Rugero who has gone to arrange the wedding of his prince, Ricardo, with the Spanish princess, Elvira—a reflection, perhaps, of Luis XIII's union with Ana of Spain in 1615. On his return the following conversation (of which I can quote only a small part) takes place between Rugero's servant and the heroine (I, 170):

Flora: ¿Cómo por España os fué?
 Ramón: Es estremado país.
 Flora: ¿Aficionados venís?
 Ramón: Aficionados, no sé,
 porque tengo para mí
 que el mundo, cual mas, cual menos,
 componen malos y buenos,
 pues las mismas cosas vi.
 Hay sabios e ignorantes;
 hay cuerdos, Flora, y hay locos,
 falsos muchos, finos pocos. . . .

This is the answer of a cosmopolite who refuses to entertain national

prejudices. He has forgotten the Pyrenees. It is improbable that it was written after 1625, the date when Richelieu sent his soldiers into the Valtelline and thereby strained relations with Spain. They remained so until well into Charles II's reign.

There is a third reason for linking this play with the period indicated. One finds what is an apparent reference to Montalbán's *La más constante mujer* (I, 172), published for the first time in his *Para todos* (1632), but very conceivably written several years earlier.

Who is the author? Not Moreto, who was not born until 1618. In many ways the play recalls Lope, though such international tolerance is not particularly characteristic of him. The plot is, in fact, the same in its general situation as that of Lope's *El hombre de bien*,⁷ much as they differ in development. In both plays, while out hunting, a young man of royal blood happens upon a beautiful woman dressed in peasant clothes. He falls madly in love with her and seeks ways of winning her to his will. In both he asks his courtier to plead his cause, not knowing that the latter has for many moons been the accepted lover of the heroine. In both the hero is the one appointed to go to the boundary line of his country in order to bring back the royal bride of his liegeland. And finally, in both there are scenes of jealousy and mutual recrimination which end only when the royal rival forgets his unworthy designs and becomes godfather at the marriage of the lovers.

The characterization is quite Lopean, particularly that of the men and of the heroine, Flora. Rosela (niece to the king who is likewise in love with the protagonist) is, however, of gentler spiritual contours than are most of this dramatist's women. In its mechanics, it is thoroughly Lopean. Like so many of his *comedias*,

⁷ Written between 1599 and 1606. See C. Bruerton, "Lope's Belardo-Lucinda Plays," *Hispanic Review*, v (1937), 310. First published in Lope's *Sexta Parte*, Madrid, Juan de la Cuesta, 1616. Interestingly enough the phrase, *hombre de bien*, occurs four times in *Luis Pérez el gallego*: II, 19, 454; III, 2, 455; 3, 456; 5, 456. Could Calderón have just been reading Lope's play? The phrase is apparently used here, as in the earlier comedy, to mean a man of gentle birth who is physically courageous. According to Liñán y Verdugo's *Avisos de los peligros que hay en la vida de corte* (Madrid, 1621), it had acquired a special meaning in Sevilla: "un gentil-hombre mancebo, de buen talle, entre estudiante y valiente, de los que comienzan en Sevilla a ganar nombre de *hombres de bien*." See ed. Manuel de Sandoval, Madrid, 1923, p. 152.

the beginning is forceful and attractive, but the second and third acts show marked inferiority. The versification is characteristic of his work between 1615 and 1628.⁸ The style is at times strikingly similar. My own feeling in the matter is confirmed by a manuscript note which is found in Schaeffer's personal copy of his *Geschichte*⁹ at Freiburg-im-Breisgau. "*La gala del nadar* ist offenbar nach einem Stücke Lope de Vega's gearbeitet," and he cites in proof of his assertion Flora's long speech (pp. 178-179) which begins: "Sean los celos fiscal..."

The author, whoever he may be, is a feminist in his point of view, and he is *anticulto*. In the second act (p. 176), we are asked:

¿No has visto aquella figura
que poetas cultos llaman
transposición, que con ella
se transponen las palabras,
que para hallar el sentido
son menester dos semanas?

The dramatist may or may not be Lope; he is certainly of that school.

RUTH LEE KENNEDY

Smith College

MOLIÈRE IN FRANCHE-COMTÉ

The speedy conquest of Franche-Comté in 1668, by Louis XIV and Condé, occasioned loud praise of the King. To the stream of complimentary verse that poured forth, Molière brought his sonnet, "Au Roy, sur la conquête de la Franche-Comté," which was published for the first time in the 1670 edition of *Amphitryon*. As it did not appear in the first edition (1668) of this play, Mesnard suggests (ix, 584-5) that a recitation of the poem served to open a performance of the comedy, given some time after March 5, 1668, the date of the *achevé* of the first edition. The chances are, Mesnard further suggests, that Molière recited the piece at the second performance of *Amphitryon*, given for the King at Versailles from the 25th to the 29th of April, 1668.

The conquest had been without bloodshed and the Comtois would

⁸ For figures, see *The Dramatic Art of Moreto*, p. 62. Cf. them with those of M. A. Buchanan's study, *The Chronology of Lope de Vega's Plays*, Toronto, 1922.

⁹ *Geschichte des spanischen Nationaldramas*, Leipzig, 1890.

have resigned themselves to becoming French subjects were it not for the disdainful attitude assumed by the invaders, which wounded their pride. Though ostensibly accepting their lot, they were not, therefore, without resentment. This resentment manifested itself in a host of satirical writings aimed at the Sun King and his sympathizers.¹ In the ranks of the latter came Molière, who received his share of chastisement in an anonymous parody made of his sonnet. This travesty, which to my knowledge has as yet received no attention, is extant in a manuscript (1055, fol. 19v) at the Public Library of Besançon. The fact that this manuscript belongs to the second half of the eighteenth century² does not exclude the possibility of its having been composed around 1670 since parodies almost always immediately followed the work attacked. Moreover, as this type of literature was widespread, the parody in question could not have failed to make the rounds, in later manuscript copies, to enlist the sympathies of eighteenth century Comtois folk.

I give here the parody in point, as sent to me by M. Piquard, who assures me he has reproduced it exactly as found in the manuscript:³

¹ Cf. *Catalogue gén. des Mss. des Bibl. publ.; Bibl. de Besançon*, vols. 32-3: ms. 38, folios 89, 103, 117, 155, 351, 392; ms. 906, fo 121; ms. 1053; ms. 1054, folios 5, 8, 65; ms. 1055; folios 18, 19, 22.

² Cf. *ibid.*, xxxii, 704. I am indebted to M. Piquard of this library, who so kindly sent me a copy of the ms. in his own hand.

³ For the sake of convenience, we reproduce here Molière's sonnet as given in the Mesnard ed. (ix, 584-5) of the poet's works:

Sonnet.

Ce sont faits inouïs, Grand Roi, que tes victoires!
L'avenir aura peine à les bien concevoir,
Et de nos vieux héros les pompeuses histoires
Ne nous ont point chanté ce que tu nous fais voir.

Quoi? presque au même instant qu'on te l'a vu résoudre,
Voir toute une province unie à tes États!
Les rapides torrents, et les vents, et la foudre,
Vont-ils, dans leurs effets, plus vite que ton bras?

N'attends pas, au retour d'un si fameux ouvrage,
Des soins de notre muse un éclatant hommage.
Cet exploit en demande, il le faut avouer;

Mais nos chansons, Grand Roi, ne sont pas si tôt prêtes,
Et tu mets moins de temps à faire tes conquêtes
Qu'il n'en faut pour les bien louer.

Le Sonnet de Molière imité

Ce sont des trahisons et non pas des victoires
 Que l'avenir jamais ne pourra concevoir
 Et de nos vieux filous les trompeuses histoires
 N'ont jamais inventé ce que tu nous fais voir.

Quoy, presque au mesme instant qu'on te l'a veu resoudre
 On voit une province unie a [sic] tes estats.
 Ce ne sont pas les vents, les canons ny la poudre
 Mais tes Louis qui vont plus viste que tes bras.

N'attens pas au retour d'un si mechant ouvrage
 Des soins de nostre muse un éclatant homage
 Cet exploit n'en veut point, il le faut avouer.

Et nos chansons seront sans peine plustot prestes
 Que tu n'auras de temps pour faire tes emplettes
 Pour blamer un trompeur plustôt [sic] que le louer.

Note that the author accuses Louis XIV of having bribed his way into Franche-Comté. This criticism is justly leveled for such was actually the case. It is known, for example, that the French had prepared the way by winning over, with promises of money, several of the most influential men in the province and especially the famous Jean de Watteville. If this parody was written soon after the publication, in 1670, of the actor-author's sonnet, we can accept it as evidence that Molière's fame was well established in Franche-Comté during his lifetime.

JOSEPH F. PRIVITERA

Saint Louis University

SAINT-RÉAL'S DON CARLOS AND PHÈDRE, 1093-6

Saint-Réal's *nouvelle* was first published in 1672. Its reputation was great enough to have attracted Racine's attention, even if he had not begun, two or three years later, to work on a play that has a somewhat similar theme. His interest in crime may well have made him note the following remarks about the noblemen who conspired against Don Carlos:

Personne ne devient scelerat tout d'un coup. Il n'appartient pas à toutes sortes d'ames de resoudre une grande méchanceté la premiere fois qu'elle vient dans la pensée. On n'arrive au crime que par degrez, de mesme qu'à la vertu.¹

¹ Pp. 33-4 in the edition of 1691 as reprinted by Albert Leitzmann, Halle,

In the dramatist's hands these prose sentences became:

Quelques crimes toujours précèdent les grands crimes.
Quiconque a pu franchir les bornes légitimes
Peut violer enfin les droits les plus sacrés;
Ainsi que la vertu, le crime a ses degrés.

There is nothing of the sort in the works that have been previously indicated as sources of *Phèdre*. Not only is the thought in the two passages the same, but in each case the psychological observation is presented three times and two concise statements are separated by one that is more elaborate. The last of Racine's four lines is an almost exact transposition into verse of Saint-Réal's third sentence. There is, however, a difference. Saint-Réal is making an analysis of crime. Racine, by putting the verses into the mouth of Hippolytus, makes them part of a plea for justice, part of an interview with his father that leads to his own condemnation and death. Instead of being a contribution to criminology, they are words filled with pathos.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON VOLTAIRE

Eight years after Voltaire's death, there appeared the second edition of the works of the "Tibulle français" who once passed for Voltaire's son: M. de Villette. This 1786 edition of the "Œuvres du Marquis de Villette" has a twofold importance. First and foremost, it can boast of three epistles in verse and eleven letters in prose of Voltaire. Yet, it has escaped the researches of Voltaire's bibliographer. Bengesco only states that the eleven letters and the first epistle addressed to Villette ("Mon Dieu, que vos rimes en -ine") are printed in the 1788 edition of Villette's works, which, according to him, apparently even lacks the two other epistles dedicated to the Marquis ("Fleuve heureux du Léthé, j'allai passer ton onde" and "Adieu, mon cher Tibulle"). It is therefore of interest to learn that the 1786 edition seemingly overlooked by the

Niemeyer, 1914. I have compared the passage with a copy of the edition of 1672 in the Library of Congress and have found the two texts identical.

famed scholar contains all three epistles in addition to the letters.¹ Quérard's Voltaire bibliography also omits this edition entirely. In Quérard's Villette bibliography, the author describes the 1786 edition, without saying where and by whom it was published.² Furthermore, no mention is made of Voltaire's letters and epistles contained therein.³

Jealously guarded by an ardent bibliophile, the copy that recently attracted my attention has 156 pages, 4 loose pages being inserted in front, and is in 16mo. The original binding is well preserved, except for a part of the back, which has been renovated. While the frontispiece indicates London, both the clean, graceful type and the solidity of the paper and binding are sufficient evidence that the book comes from the press of the alleged publisher of Voltaire's "Pucelle": Hubert-Martin Cazin in Paris. Cazin specialized in publishing prohibited books. Turning to account Voltaire's often repeated praise of the freedom of the press in England, Cazin published his books under the heading of London, or La Haye, Amsterdam, Genève, Venise, although they were invariably printed in France and Geneva.

The second striking particularity of the present edition is revealed in the introductory "Épître dédicatoire" by Pierre Alexandre Léorier-Delisle, the manufacturer of the paper marking this edition. The dedication is addressed to the French inventor Charles Louis Marquis Ducrest, better known as the brother of the "bel esprit" Mme de Genlis, who visited Voltaire at Ferney as an enthusiastic admirer of the patriarch, but vituperated her former idol under the Restoration. Léorier-Delisle, after previous experiments devoted to the production of paper from rags, grass and silk,

¹ Georges Bengesco, *Voltaire, Bibliographie de ses œuvres*. Ed. Rouveyre & G. Blond, and Perrin, Paris, 1882-1889, III, 202-203; I, 250 et seq. The "Épîtres" are printed in the *Œuvres*, éd. Moland, x, 454-458. The letters are published *ibid.*; XLIII-XLV and L.

² J.-M. Quérard, *La France littéraire, ou Dictionnaire bibliographique*. Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1839, x, 207-208.

³ Quérard also records two editions of which I was unable to find any mention in Bengesco's work: *Œuvres du Marquis de Villette*, Londres, et Paris, Clousier, 1784, in-12, 270 pages, and *Œuvres du chevalier de Boufflers et du marquis de Villette*, Londres (Paris), 1782, in-18. The latter contain, according to Quérard, several unpublished letters of Voltaire. More detailed information on the editions of Villette's works is given in Jean Stern, *Belle et Bonne; Une Fervente Amie de Voltaire (1757-1822)*. Hachette, 1938, p. 219, appendix VI.

announces in the "Epître dédicatoire" that he has finally found hitherto useless vegetables which could be turned to paper and would thus be able to remedy the plight of the French paper manufactures. Accordingly, the 156 pages of the present volume are made of the bark of the yew-tree, and 20 additional sample pages are fabricated from the following vegetables: lime-tree stinging-nettle, hop, moss, reed, hairweed, osier, willow, elm, oak, dog-grass, spindle-tree, hazel-tree, burdock, coltsfoot, thistle, dandelion and poplar.

Viewed in the light of Voltaire's profound interest in the art of printing, this landmark in the history of French books assumes particular importance. His bitter experiences with Duchesne, Lambert, Ledet, Pampie, Prault père and Prieur, the sight of "Edipe," "Brutus," "Zulime," "Oreste," "Olympie" mutilated by "les omissions, les interpolations mal placées, les fautes de calcul, les noms défigurés, les fausses dates,"⁴ full of those "contresens inintelligibles,"⁵ and a careful study of the evolution of printing throughout the preceding centuries had convinced him that artistic printers had nearly become extinct in his day.⁶ He deplored that the miserable editions released by French publishers "font dire aux étrangers que l'imprimerie tombe en France avec la littérature."⁷ Moreover, "La Guerre civile de Genève"⁸ and the "Essais sur les mœurs et l'esprit des nations"⁹ clearly reflect his marked interest in the manufacture of paper. Once he told Gabriel Cramer that the heavy taxes on paper were chiefly responsible for the sad condition of French typography.¹⁰ In view of this, it is safe to assume that Voltaire, had he but lived another few years, would have been greatly pleased with this 1786 edition, remarkable as to get-up, printing and paper. The rarity of this precious book is undoubtedly the cause of its omission in the bibliography of Voltaire.¹¹

HENRY H. REMAK

Indiana University

⁴ *Œuvres de Voltaire*, éd. Moland, xxxviii, 156.

⁵ *Ibid.*, xxxvi, 118.

⁶ *Ibid.*, x, 415. See also xxxvi, 312; xlii, 127; xlii, 543 and xlv, 226.

⁷ *Ibid.*, xxxvi, 119.

⁸ *Ibid.*, xi, 171, and xii, 54.

⁹ *Ibid.*, ix, 545.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, xlvii, 517.

¹¹ I wish to thank Prof. Norman L. Torrey of Columbia University, Prof. George R. Havens of The Ohio State University and Prof. Ira Wade of Princeton University for their helpful suggestions in relation to this article.

FAIGUET, RÉFORMATEUR DE L'ORTHOGRAPHE

Les idées de l'économiste Joachim Faiguet de Villeneuve¹ (1703-1780) sur la réforme de l'orthographe ont passé presque inaperçues chez les historiens de ce sujet qui a tellement intrigué les esprits curieux du dix-huitième siècle. Faiguet ne figure pas dans l'étude, d'ailleurs très étendue, de Didot;² dans Brunot³ une dizaine de lignes lui sont consacrées, mais son système phonétique (ou ce qui passait pour tel) n'y paraît pas, et le titre de son ouvrage principal est cité inexactement (il s'agit de *L'Econome politique*, non de *L'Economie politique*).

Dans les plus ambitieuses de ses œuvres—entre autres le *Mémoire pour la suppression des festes* (s. l., vers 1750), *L'Econome politique, projet pour enrichir et perfectionner l'espèce humaine* (Londres et Paris, 1763) et *L'Ami des pauvres* (Paris, 1766)—Faiguet énonça des idées sur l'économie politique qui, loin de faire école, furent même ridiculisées;⁴ et c'est dans ces trois ouvrages—surtout dans les deux derniers—qu'il introduit ses réflexions sur l'orthographe. Sans prétention, et gouverné par la modération et le bon sens, il éclaircit ainsi dans la préface de *L'Econome politique* le système d'orthographe qu'il emploiera dans le corps de l'ouvrage :

... on y remarquera quelques licences de nouvelle ortografe, que bien des gens n'approuveront peut etre pas. Sur cela come sur autre chose, nous les laisserons dans leur opinion sans nous en inquiéter. Nous avons préféré, a l'exemple de nos célèbres Modernes, une maniere d'ortografier plus

¹ Faiguet fut d'abord maître de pension et marchand de cochons, puis littérateur; il écrivit pour l'*Encyclopédie* (et non l'*Encyclopédie méthodique*, comme disent certaines biographies) les articles Citation, Dimanche, Epargne et Etudes, lesquels "ont été remarqués parmi les bons" selon la *Correspondance de Grimm* (Paris, Garnier, 1878, v, 298). Il publia aussi des essais et des poèmes dans le *Mercure* et dans d'autres journaux.

² A.-F. Didot, *Observations sur l'orthographie française*, Paris, 1867.

³ *Histoire de la langue française*, Paris, 1932, vi, 2^{me} partie, 951.

⁴ Dans la *Correspondance de Grimm* (vii, 97, année 1766) Faiguet fut qualifié de "bon et insipide rêveur de bien public," et plus tard de "pauvre diable de la classe de ces philosophes spéculatifs, dont le nombre s'est si prodigieusement accru depuis vingt ans" (viii, 312, année 1796). La *Biographie universelle* (éd. Michaud, Paris, 1815, xiv, 101) rapporte que "les différents ouvrages qu'il a publiés, intéressants par le sujet, mais rédigés avec trop peu de méthode et de soin, n'eurent que peu de succès lors de leur publication, et sont depuis longtemps oubliés."

conséquente et plus analogue aux sons que n'est l'orthographe ordinaire. Celle-ci, toute hérissée de caractères et de signes inutiles, embarrasse la plupart des Lecteurs, surtout les Etrangers amateurs de notre Langue. On nous y laisse de vieilles traces d'une Prononciation qui n'est plus d'usage; de même que de prétendues indications d'Etimologie qui n'éclaircissent ni les Savans ni les Ignorans. Ce sont là des observances futiles et mal entendues; ou pour parler plus juste, ce sont des superstitions Littéraires que notre siècle doit proscrire. On espère donc que les Gens Raisonables nous passeront le peu de licences que nous avons prises, d'autant mieux que nous n'avons rien négligé a d'autres égars pour doner une Edition des plus nettes et des plus exactes.

Quelques mots tirés de son texte démontrent combien son procédé est simple et lucide:

boneur	peïs (pays)	chédeuvres
lontems	trionfera	condanant
pié (pied)	filosofie	décendants
fame (femme)	égar (égard)	baucoup
home	garsons	anees (années)
se marira (mariera)	u (eu)	daillieurs
quatrevint-seize	poura	aujourdui
soissante-set	se metre	meurs (mœurs)
péyee (payée)	dabor	come vous le voudriés

L'édition de 1766, portant le nouveau titre de *l'Ami des pauvres, ou l'Econome politique*, est suivie de *Deux Mémoires intéressans sur les maîtrises et sur les fêtes*, dans lesquels Faiguet essaie un système d'écriture phonétique. L'utilité de ses caractères, tout ingénieux qu'ils sont, est fort douteuse; il faut convenir que cette invention aurait donné à la langue française, comme dit la *Correspondance de Grimm*,⁵ "un air esclavon." Cependant ses caractères sont de beaucoup plus simples, ses mots plus compréhensibles que ceux de certains autres amateurs de phonétique; on reconnaît à peine, par exemple, les mots *ôtùs, dize, muhe, grhe, sézùr*, qui, chez Restif de la Bretonne, représentent *honteux, digne, mouille, grille* et *seigneur*.

Voici comment Faiguet explique les nouveaux caractères d'impression qu'il emploie dans ses 70 dernières pages:

- æ se met pour ai, ay; ainsi *mætre* pour *maître*, *væ* pour *vray*.
 œ se met pour oi; ainsi *mœteur* pour *moiteur*, *lœ* pour *loi*.
 ʎ se met pour ch; ainsi *ʎeval* pour *cheval*, *mouʎe* pour *mouche*.
 ʍ se met pour gn; ainsi *campauæ* pour *campagne*.
 ʌ se met pour ill; ainsi *bouaon* pour *bouillon*, *paæ* pour *paille*.
 k se met pour qu; ainsi *ke, ki* pour *que, qui*; *preske* pour *presque*.
 T se met pour y; ainsi *roTaume* pour *royaume*.

⁵ VII, 97 (année 1766).

A l'égard du *p* & du *b*, pour peu qu'on ait étudié les sons de notre langue, on sait que c'est presque le même son; que le son *p* ne diffère du son *b* qu'en ce que le premier est plus fort que le second; ainsi pour désigner ces sons si analogues, nous employons le même caractère, je veux dire le π grec, qui n'a ni queue ni tête, de sorte que nous le mettons dans sa position naturelle pour remplacer notre *p*, & que nous le renversons pour remplacer notre *b*; & cela uniquement pour avoir des caractères compris entre deux parallèles: ainsi nous mettons *pas* pour *pas*, *bas* pour *bas*, *parabole* pour *parabole*.

EDWARD D. SEEBER

Indiana University

SOME LINGUISTIC STUDIES OF 1937 AND 1938¹

Two more volumes of the English Place-Name Society have come out during the period covered by this survey.² Both volumes are sound pieces of work, and advance greatly our knowledge of the place-names of the counties treated. The following comments have to do with various matters of detail. The many Old-Icelandic forms given in Dr Smith's volume are nearly always referred to as OScaud (Old Scandinavian); thus, on pp. 4, 19, 27, 29, 35, 38, 41 etc. The propriety of giving these forms is not in question, but since they are actually classical Icelandic of the 13th and 14th centuries, it seems a bit misleading to call them Old Scandinavian, a term which in ordinary scientific usage means something quite different. Since the hypothetical OE *gips* (p. 5) must in any case get its initial [g] from the Scandinavian, and since no related English forms in [ps] or [sp] are adduced, it would seem only reasonable to derive the hypothetical word as a whole from the Scandinavian. It would be enlightening to know why [p] developed in *Patrington* (p. 25) but not in *Ottringham* (p. 31). On *Withernsea* (p. 26) and *Withernwick* (p. 69), see E. Ekwall, *SNPh.* x 113 ff. There seems no good reason for calling the *b* of *Camberwell* (p. 55) euphonic. A word on the dissimilation [pf > tf] in *Hatfield* (p. 63) would be in place. The *n* of *Houndale* (p. 94) is to be derived from earlier *l* by dissimilation; all reference to a by-form *Holmr* should be deleted. Some explanation should be given of the alternative pronunciations of the second element of *Wansford* (p. 95). Words in *-ing* should not be called patronymics

¹ This survey is limited to books sent to *MLN* for review.

² xiv, *The Place-Names of the East Riding of Yorkshire and York*, by A. H. Smith, pp. lx, 351; xv, *The Place-Names of Hertfordshire*, by J. E. B. Gover, Allen Mawer and F. M. Stenton, pp. xlv, 342; Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, The Macmillan Co. \$6 (18 s.) each.

(p. 100) unless they are actually so. The name *Múli*, though called OEScand (p. 125), has a classical Icelandic look. I see no reason to reject the DB form *Colnun* (p. 126); we have here a dat. pl. with suffixed article, equivalent to Icel. *kollunum*. The change [s > þ] in *Thixendale* (p. 133) may have developed out of a lisping pronunciation of the [s], or it may have been a case of dissimilation. On *Acklam* (p. 147) see E. Ekwall, *SNPh.* x 107 ff. The term "early English" (p. 190) in the sense "early modern English" is unhappy. The first pronunciation given for *Thearne* (p. 201) is puzzling. The *y* of *yrcebiscop* (p. 233) is hardly to be explained as an inverted spelling; it is more likely a genuine West-Saxonism. *Gunne* (p. 239) and *Jóke* (p. 256) are not "reduced" forms but hypocoristic forms. The first element of *Griðthorpe* (p. 240) may be OE *gripu* 'caldron' (for another possibility, see *NED.* under *grip* sb.²). *Huvuþ* (p. 251) may be Norwegian; see A. Noreen, *Altisl. Gram.*, 4th ed., p. 107. A reference to the OIcel record of *Skornir* (p. 273) would be desirable. The term *lenation* (p. 279) is objectionable; the correct linguistic form is *lenition*, duly used elsewhere in the volume. I note a misprint on p. 292, line 4.

In the volume on Hertfordshire, the reference to the "continental Anglo-Saxons" (p. xiv) is unfortunate, since we have no right to presume that the Angles and Saxons made one people on the Continent. The spelling *debateable* (p. xvi) is deplorable. Is *Stortford* really pronounced [sta:sfəd], as we are told on p. xxv? The AN substitution of [ð] for the English palatal voiced spirant seems to me quite natural, and by no means an "eccentricity" (p. 15). *Frogmore* (p. 23) is hardly so corrupt a form as the authors think. Unluckily the connecting links between *Fognam* and *Fogmer* have not come down to us, but since the name is often coupled with *field* we may safely presume that *Fognam fel(d)* might have been pronounced as **Fognamvel* or, with assimilation, **Fogmel*. Such a form, coupled once more with *field*, might then, by dissimilation, become *Fogmer*, whence the later *Fogmore*. The current *Frogmore* owes its first *r* to contamination with the other *Frogmores* of the county. The brilliant etymology of *Tring* (p. 25) cannot be accepted, because of the initial [t]. If we take OE *bufan* in the sense 'from above,' the etymology of *Bovingdon* (p. 29) becomes clearer. The [t] of *Caddington* (p. 30) wants explanation; we have here a case of dissimilation [d...d > d...t]. The *n*-infix in *Harpenden* and the like (pp. 38, 92, 171, 205) ought not to be discussed without reference to cases like *nightingale* and *messenger*, whatever the chronology. It would seem that a tendency

existed to insert [n] in a weak penult before a stop or affricate of the ultima. If penult as well as ultima began with a stop, this seemed to facilitate the insertion. *Organ* (p. 61) is better taken in the sense 'hurdy-gurdy.' If an OE *rādgeldēte* existed, it did not mean 'junction of roads' (p. 61). *Tibberstreet* became *Tibbolstreet* by dissimilation (p. 62); confusion with *Theobald* followed, but had nothing to do with the rise of the dissimilated form. I doubt the soundness of the description of the *sh* of *Shoppesle* as "eccentric" (p. 96); very possibly *sh* meant the same as *s* to this speller, in which case the *s* is quite as it should be and the eccentricity is confined to the *h*. It is hard to see how *Wiggen* (from *Wiðgen*) with its stop [g] can be got from OE **wiþegn* (p. 107). Phonologically the form is derivable from OE *wiðgan*, pp. 'with-gone' i. e. 'withdrawn' or the like. A withdrawn nook might mean simply a remote, out-of-the-way place. The change of *Pulver mead* to *Pulmer mead* (p. 110) need not have come about by popular etymology; we may have here a case of what the Germans call *fernassimilation*. The derivation of *Ayot* from OE *Æga* plus *geat* (p. 119) seems unlikely, since the genitival *n* is wanting. I venture the suggestion that *Ayot* may come from *eagegeat* 'eye-gap.' One does not think of Baghdad as an Arabian city (p. 120). It is by no means clear (p. 123) that "the scribe got confused between final *t* and initial *d*" in writing *Tæccingawyrðe*; the initial *t* may be perfectly genuine, the original *d* having been assimilated to the *t* of the preceding *æt*. The explanation given for *Digswell* (p. 124) seems to me unsound. No forms in *n* appear before the 13th century, whereas forms in *l* are recorded for the 11th and 12th centuries. We must therefore proceed on the assumption that the *l*-forms are the original ones. From these the nasal forms can be derived by dissimilation. The form *Digswell* itself, which has neither *l* nor *n* in its first member, is derivable from the *l*-form by dissimilation; in this case the *l* was dropped instead of being turned into an *n*. The alternation *Suening* / *Swaning* (p. 131) indicates the presence in OE of forms with and without *i*-mutation side by side; confusion with Scandinavian *Sveinn* is not indicated by this alteration. The *t* of *Haultwick* is perhaps not so irregular (p. 135) after all; certainly the change [ld > lt] is not infrequent in English, witness the dialectal *holt* for *hold*, and such familiar forms as *spilt*. The *bb* forms of *Crowbury* (p. 143) show assimilation: *wb* > *bb*. *Weston* (p. 146) is perhaps better explained as 'abandoned or deserted farm.' The form *Horeswell* (p. 160), added to the difficulty about the *d*, makes unlikely the etymology offered by Ekwall. Derivation from OE *horg* seems more plausible. The *d*

of DB is presumably [ð] and may be interpreted as an Anglo-Norman substitute for the spirant *g* of the English form. *Wardington* may be got from the older *Waterdon* (p. 174) by metathesis (t. .d > d. .t) and assimilation (r > n); the *r* of the current form is only a spelling, to mark the preceding vowel as [ɔ:]. The Ptolemaic tribal name *Chaideinoi* (which must be connected with OE *hæp*) indicates that the *d* of *Hadham* (p. 176) may be original. *Mentley* (p. 197) is a beautiful example of dissimilation. The first element of *Essendon* (p. 223) is *Esa*, in spite of the KCD form. The man might be called either *Esa* (true name) or *Esla* (diminutive of *Esa*, used as pet name). I have noted a misprint on p. 8, line 5.

Rolf Kaiser has made a painstaking and useful study of the geographical distribution in ME of words not used throughout English-speaking territory.³ His book falls into four parts: I, comparison of texts extant in northern and southern versions (here *Cursor Mundi* gives the bulk of the evidence); II, study of certain texts safely localized and dated; III, study of texts the localization of which is doubtful; and IV, alphabetical list (1) of northern words and (2) of southern words, with exact references to their places of occurrence in the monuments studied. The author has gone through an astonishing number of texts (listed on pp. 292-307); on the other hand, he has made practically no use of the place-name material, though not unaware of its importance for an investigation of this kind (see p. 165 footnote). He tells us in his preface that *er sich durchaus bewusst ist, nur einen bescheidenen Anfang geleistet zu haben*, and expresses the hope that his work may prove a useful basis for further studies in the geographical distribution of the English vocabulary. Of particular interest is his localization of the Gawain poet in Westmorland or southern Cumberland (p. 168). The author has found few words restricted to the south; his explanation of this peculiarity (p. 114) does not take into account the linguistic prestige which the south enjoyed. He holds to the old view that the *Pricke* is by Rolle, though aware (p. 117) that Rolle's authorship is no longer generally believed in. His statement that the romanian element of the English vocabulary *durch seinen Wortakzent jede stabende Dichtung stören und vernichten musste* (p. 168) holds good only to a limited degree; in particular, many words taken from French had main or secondary stress on the first syllable, or soon gained initial stress in English.

³ *Zur Geographie des me. Wortschatzes*, von Rolf Kaiser; Leipzig, Mayer & Müller, 1937; pp. x, 318; map.

Herbert Koziol's handbook⁴ is a superior piece of work. It is well ordered and well written, and shows a good command of the material. The following notes may prove of use for the next edition. It is hardly right to link monosyllabism so closely to the Germanic parts of the vocabulary (p. 10); many words of French origin are monosyllabic, as *ease*, *please*, *aim* etc. As a taker of words from foreign languages, and particularly from Latin (pp. 10 f., 14), English has outdone German but hardly French, and not a few languages (as Finnish, Welsh, Turkish) have gone even further than English in the matter of borrowing words. In my childhood the railway train went choo-choo rather than puff-puff (p. 23). For a different view of the so-called imperative formations (p. 57), see O. Behaghel, *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* xxv 133 f. *Barton* means 'farm-yard' not 'Scheune' (p. 63), and OE *bere* meant 'barley' not 'Weizen' (pp. 63 f.). The form *ill-supported* (p. 69) is misplaced. OE *þærwiþ* (p. 76) still lives, as *therewith*. The word *anent* (p. 77) is also still in use. A few words seem to have dropped out on p. 140 (fourth line from bottom). The suffixes *-t* and *-ock* (p. 143) are not properly classified as diminutives; see F. A. Wood, *Some Parallel Formations in English* (Hesperia Ergänzungsreihe, vol. 1). Is *girleen* (p. 148) a slip for *colleen*? The author seems to imply (p. 151) that *clothier* is obsolete; if so, he is mistaken. The author should have pointed out (p. 157) that the feminine suffix *-ess* is on the decline; we no longer say *teacheress*, for example, but prefer to say *woman teacher* on the few occasions where we feel it needful to bring in the matter of sex. In connexion with the suffix *-al* (p. 164) or elsewhere, the author should have mentioned *burial* and *bridal*, in which the *-al* (contrast *riddle*) is felt to be suffixal. *Foursome* and the like are not now dialectal (p. 185), though they may have been once upon a time. The author seems to have overlooked (p. 191) K. Uhler's dissertation on OE *-lice*; in it Uhler proves that the adverbial function of this suffix goes back to OE times. The etymology given for *beg* and *beggar* (p. 195) is wrong, as is shown by the fact that the early spelling was regularly *begger*. Under the head "Aufspaltung" (pp. 199 f.) should be included cases like *gate* / *gait*, and *tire* / *tyre*, where differences in spelling were seized upon to make two words out of one. The spelling *marse* for the short form of *master* (p. 224) might have been mentioned. The explanation given for *nugget* (p. 231) is not acceptable; the NED derives the word from a dialectal *nug*. Alongside *tawdry* and the

⁴ *Handbuch der engl. Wortbildungslehre*, von H. Koziol; Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1937; pp. xvi, 260; RM 9.

like (p. 231) might have been included examples of proper names, as *Ned* from *mine Ed.* The author should have made much more of *tabu*, which he mentions as an afterthought, it would seem (p. 242). To the list of misprints (p. 244), add *greveling* (p. 190).

Miss M. M. Roseborough's *Outline of Middle English Grammar*⁵ is devoted chiefly to phonology; the inflexions are covered in 20 pages, and only three pages are given to syntax. The book is intended for the beginner. It is primarily historical rather than descriptive, and presupposes a working knowledge of Old English. Much attention is rightly given to the differences between the ME dialects, and the attempt is made to explain these differences historically. Unluckily the author often falls into careless statements apt to mislead the unwary, and the book cannot be called a safe one for beginners unless a competent teacher is at hand to supply the needful qualifications and corrections. Thus, from the discussion of orthography (p. 2) an uninitiated person would naturally conclude that the OE letter þ was not used in ME, and we are told in so many words (p. 4) that *qu* for OE *cw* is a "sign-post" for the Northern dialect. On p. 13 the author says (rightly enough) that scholars disagree as to whether the ME spelling *e* for OE long *æ* has any phonetic significance, but on p. 15 we learn that "it is generally agreed that long and short *æ* underwent phonetic change in ME." These two statements are perhaps reconcilable, but on the face of it they do not agree, and the student may well be puzzled. The use of the term "double consonants" for consonant groups like *st* (p. 9) is unorthodox, though it will not lead the student seriously astray. Many other passages, more or less unhappy, might be quoted, but I see no need of laboring the point. The author makes no mention of either Luick or Jordan. Karl Brunner's *Abriss*⁶ is also a book meant for beginners, but the author uses his equally limited space to better advantage than does Miss Roseborough. Indeed, Brunner gives us as full and clear a presentation of ME grammar as we could hope for in such narrow room. He skilfully combines morphology and syntax under the head, "Flexionsformen und ihre Verwendung" (this section makes up about half the book). The work as a whole is a masterpiece of accurate condensation. His picture of the neglect of English for literary purposes after 1066 is a somewhat exaggerated one (p. 1), and the implication (*ibid.*) that the OE orthographical tradition died out is contradicted by his later discussion of the spelling sys-

⁵ Macmillan, New York, 1938; pp. x, 112; map; chart; \$2.

⁶ *Abriss der mittellenglischen Grammatik*; Niemeyer, Halle, 1938; pp. 90; RM 2. 40.

tem (pp. 3 f.). I am highly sceptical about the hypothetical Anglo-Norman copyists of English manuscripts (p. 5); the English themselves, I fear, must take the blame for their own inconsistencies and mistakes in spelling, except for legal documents like the Domesday Book and a few other exceptional pieces of writing. On p. 19, the words *im Silbenanlaut* should be deleted, and the brackets should be removed from the words following. On p. 59 the author fails to mention *erst* (OE *ærest*) in his discussion of the ordinals.

A. S. C. Ross has done a careful and important study of the OE glosses in the so-called Durham Book.⁷ His method of attack is particularly to be commended, and his results have significance in many branches of OE studies. The following details seem worthy of more or less critical comment. The term *Avestic* (p. 13 and elsewhere) seems needless, since the language already has *Avestan* in the same sense. Why not *Walde-Pokorny* (p. 15 and elsewhere)? The author's explanation of the *e* of *sune* (p. 52) is not convincing, and his conclusion (p. 53) that the scribe himself used only a palatal variety of the weak vowel must be rejected as not borne out by the evidence. The reference to Luick (p. 54) gives a false impression. That authority derived the *a* of *herepāþ* and the like from an earlier *o*, and he conceived this *o* to have arisen in weak syllables under the influence of labial consonants. This obviously has no bearing on the gen. sg. ending *-as* for regular *-es*, unless the *-as* can be associated with bases ending in a labial consonant. Luick also mentions the particles *ac*, *at*, the *a* of which he also derives from an earlier *o*; in these words the round vowel may have arisen under the influence of nasals or labials of neighboring words in sentence combinations. Ross's explanation of the *-as* ending is fundamentally different from all this, and one is puzzled at the citation of Luick. The *-as* is better explained as derived from the earlier *-es*; in the scribe's pronunciation the weak vowel had a darker color before final *s*, and he sometimes departed from traditional orthography to indicate this color, using (properly enough) an *a* for the purpose. Alternatively, we may avoid speculation about the color of the scribe's weak vowel by supposing that the gen. sg. *-es* and the nom. acc. pl. *-as* had been leveled in the scribe's pronunciation, and that in consequence he sometimes used for the gen. sg. the spelling traditionally associated with the nom. acc. pl. The analogy discussed on p. 56 appears also in Gothic *u*-stems (in

⁷ *Studies in the Accidence of the Lindisfarne Gospels*; Leeds School of English Language: Texts and Monographs, No. II; Leeds, 1937; pp. 179; 10 sh.

i-stems it worked the other way). On p. 58, line 14, read iii for ii. The *his* surely marks *edo* (p. 60) as sing. The *o* may be due to influence from the in-stems; such a word as *mengo* 'crowd' might well be associated with a fem. group-name like *eowd* 'flock, herd' and give it -*o* for a sing. ending. If Icel. *róða* is from English, its weak inflexion supports the author's argument (p. 68). The discussion on p. 73 seems confused. The variation *ðy* / *ðiu* nom. sg. fem. is parallel to *þy* / *ðio* instr. sg.; similarly *ðys* / *ðius* nom. sg. fem. and *ðys* / *ðios* instr. sg. (pp. 115 ff.). I conceive that the phonetic alternation became familiar first in the instr. and then was extended to the nom. sg. fem. If *fræгна* is a strong verb (pp. 131 f.), it belongs presumably to the sixth class (with nasal present, like *standan*). Ross might have cited as a parallel the North German *fragen*, pret. *frug* (presumably Low German in origin), although here the nasal has been leveled out of the present; certainly it cannot be said that this verb has been "hitherto unknown." The postulated PrGmc form is obscure to me.

Two of the tracts of the Society for Pure English will next be considered.⁸ No. XLVIII is made up of three short papers: Linguistic Self-Criticism, by Otto Jespersen; Terminology in Physics, by C. G. Darwin; and The Irregularities of English, by Sir W. A. Craigie. The first of these is a penetrating as well as agreeable discussion of what Jespersen calls speakers' asides, i. e. interruptions in the flow of words, breaks made in order to set forth the speaker's attitude toward what he is saying: e. g. *truth to tell*, *strictly speaking*, etc. Darwin's paper, reprinted from the 138th volume of *Nature*, is likewise of some interest; it deals with the problem of devising suitable technical terms in physics, and makes a few suggestions which, if adopted, will surely help. Sir William's paper on irregularities, however, is so slight that one wonders why it was printed. It reveals, to be sure, a pre-scientific philosophy of language hardly to be expected of the foremost of living lexicographers, but the disillusionment is one that we might have been spared. Tract No. L, by Sir William Craigie, is a pleasant essay, informative to the layman, on Northern words in Modern English. By northern the author means not only north-country and Scottish English but also Scandinavian. He discusses a number of words taken into standard speech from northern sources during modern times. I will comment on one detail only: *Virginian Reel* (p. 353) should be *Virginia reel*; Sir William's long stay in the United States was evidently not long enough.

⁸ XLVIII and L; Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1937; pp. 269-291 and 327-362; 85 cents each.

H. A. Treble and G. H. Vallins have given us, in dictionary form,⁹ a work more condensed than H. W. Fowler's *Modern English Usage* but written under the influence of that brilliant and vicious book. The *ABC* is handy to use, and has much good in it, but belongs essentially to the pre-scientific age. The authors, like Fowler, have caught little of the spirit and the point of view of modern linguistic scholarship. Their respect for facts is hardly greater than that of the 18th century grammarians who sought to make English over on the Latin model. The term *usage* in their title means, not actual usage as determined by scientific investigation, but the linguistic prejudices of the authors, prejudices which on some points are so strong as to deprive them of their linguistic birthright, namely, their feeling for the language. Strange as it may seem, the authors actually recommend *Whom were you speaking to?* They admit that *Who were you speaking to?* is "so common as to be almost [!] idiomatic." But, they say, "the fact remains that *to*, though far removed, does still govern the interrogative pronoun in the accusative; and 'Whom were you speaking to?' should always be the version in writing" (p. 148). This is truly prescriptive rather than descriptive grammar. The authors ignore the facts of usage when these facts disagree with their preconceived ideas. In other words, their procedure is thoroughly unscientific and anti-intellectual. In this, unluckily, they are only typical; the book market swarms with grammars and rhetorics written on the same principles.

The two dictionaries which we will next consider¹⁰ both have merit. Partridge, well known already for his many publications in the field of shady speech, here brings his collections together in a volume of impressive proportions. I have been unable to examine every entry in this 1000-page work, but I have gone through many pages, and find the work deserving of confidence, so far as the facts are concerned, though naturally slips sometimes occur, as when the author speaks of "the omission of the relative *that*," which "is recorded as early as C. 13" (p. 873), the implication being that the construction arose at that time; but see Curme *Syntax* pp. 233 ff. (asyndetic relative construction). Under *britches* (p. 94) this spelling of *breeches* is explained as a result of "careless pronunciation," whereas it actually does no more than give written

⁹ *An ABC of English Usage*; Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1937; pp. 195; \$1.50.

¹⁰ *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*, by Eric Partridge; Macmillan, New York, 1937; pp. xvi, 999; \$12.50. *A Mark Twain Lexicon*, by R. L. Ramsay and F. G. Emberson; Univ. of Missouri Studies XIII, 1 (Jan., 1938); pp. cxx, 278; \$1.25.

expression to the regular pronunciation (surely Partridge does not pronounce *breeches* with a long *e*). But here we enter a different province: the author's facts are usually right but his explanations are often bad—sometimes even absurd, as in the present case. An amazing etymology is the derivation of *filly* 'girl' from French *fille* (p. 275), instead of from *filly* 'young mare.' The derivation of *fanny* from the name of Cleland's heroine (p. 266) has a certain plausibility, but why did Cleland call her Fanny? I derive both *Fanny* and *fanny* from the earlier *fancy*, used in 1657 by Thornley in the Epistle Dedicatory of his translation of *Daphnis and Chloe*, but ignored by the lexicographers (including Partridge). Under *bugger* (p. 103) the author remarks, quite gratuitously and in all likelihood slanderously, "the Albigenian heretics were often perverts." Such observations have no place in a work of this kind (if indeed anywhere). The word *bugger* is here spelt out, but elsewhere it may appear as *b****r*; such exhibitions of prudery are not only inconsistent but foolish, and unworthy of the author. The derivation of *kaput* in the phrase *finer kaput* (p. 276) would have given the author less trouble if he had consulted a German dictionary; it is a familiar German word, derived, indeed, from the term *capot* in the game of piquet, but with a subsequent history and meaning of its own. *Folks* (better, *just folks*) in the U. S. means, not 'respectable people' (p. 294) but plain, ordinary, everyday people. The dictionary would be more valuable if it included more Americanisms, but the author takes into account only such American words as have become established in British usage. The Ramsay-Emberson lexicon grew out of an elaborate study of Mark Twain's vocabulary which for many years has been in progress at the University of Missouri under Professor Ramsay's competent direction. The book makes no attempt to give all the words that Mark Twain used. The words selected for inclusion, 7802 in number, were chosen, as the authors tell us, "with four aims in mind. We have tried to collect all of his Americanisms, . . . all of his new words, formations, and usages, . . . all of his archaisms, . . . Finally, we have included . . . certain miscellaneous groups of words which seemed to be significant or interesting for various reasons." The lexicon proper is preceded by an elaborate analysis of Mark Twain's vocabulary, a monograph in itself. The analysis ends with a list of "problem words" (p. cxii), to which the authors invite the special attention of those who may be interested in finding solutions. In most cases the authors themselves have solved the problem admirably, but a few words call for more or less comment. The poker terms *deuces-and* and *kings-and* illustrate the use of

and in final position; the authors rightly cite as a parallel the *ham and* (i.e. ham and eggs) of American lunch-rooms and restaurants. But *and* may occur finally, not only in words and phrases but also in sentences, witness the following: "This is the window he stood between me and." The derivation of *biggity* from *big-head-y* is surely right, but needs a phonetic footnote: unstressed intervocalic *d* and *t* in American speech are hard to distinguish, and once *head* lost its stress in the combination *big-head-y* it might well become *-it-*. *Dusty Christian* 'worthless, vile Christian' may refer to the humility of the mourners' bench, a state of mind which Mark Twain could not bring himself to. The authors' comment on *liked to* (p. 135) implies that *liked* is pronounced with a [d] in some forms of English, but surely Mark Twain, who heard "no -d in actual colloq. Am. pronunciation," would have heard none wherever he went. I cannot agree with the authors on their interpretation of the apostrophe in *Miss' Sally*. The preceding passage, where *Missus* is used, indicates that the apostrophe marks the omission of the *-us*. Certainly *Miss'* cannot be for *Miz*, which would never be used with a Christian name, whether the lady were married or single. The derivation of *sny* from French *chenal* seems correct, but makes phonetic difficulties. Could a palatal *l* have been used in this word? A variant *chenail* would become *sny* much more readily than the regular form *chenal*. The emendation of *white-sleeve* to *white-slave* which the authors suggest seems plausible. Further investigation should concern itself with Mark Twain's handwriting and with his proof-reading. Did he write *a* in such a way that it might be mistaken for *ee*? And did he read proof carefully or not? It ought to be possible to get reliable information on both these matters. The list of Mark Twain's "Indelicate terms and euphemisms" (p. lvi) is amazingly short, and even this list is not fully supported in the lexicon proper by the examples quoted. Thus, it seems incredible that Mark Twain never once used *ass* in the sense 'arse,' yet the authors give no quotation for this sense. The expurgation of his published works must have been a thorough job indeed.

Hans-Oskar Wilde, now associated with Morsbach in the editorship of *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, has brought out, as vol. 94 of that series, an unusually interesting and important phonetic study.¹¹ This is one of the few phonetic investigations in which the instrumental and acoustic methods are combined, and the combination has proved fruitful, though more questions are raised than

¹¹ *Der Industrie-Dialekt von Birmingham, Intonation und Sprachvariante*; Niemeyer, Halle, 1938; pp. 88; RM 3.40.

are answered. Of particular value for the non-instrumentalist is the reproduction, in phonetic notation, of two monologues by Graham Squiers in Birmingham dialect; the modified standard spelling which Squiers himself used does not present his hero's pronunciation with precision. Wilde in his investigation made use of the two monologues in two forms: a printed text and a gramophone record. By comparison of the two he was able to come to interesting conclusions about the spelling system which Squiers used; more especially, about the significance of certain spelling variants. Such variants, familiar in medieval manuscripts, are usually dismissed as without phonetic significance, but Sievers attached great importance to them in his later investigations. Wilde finds that the variations in spelling (e. g. *yo* and *yer* for *you*) in Squiers' printed text actually have phonetic significance, though a satisfactory phonetic interpretation was not always possible. Wilde's study of the intonation of the monologues revealed that the pitch-range of the stressed syllables was less than that of the unstressed syllables: the high pitches were higher, the low pitches lower, if the syllable was unstressed. For further *Ergebnisse* the reader is referred to the monograph itself. It must not be supposed, however, that Wilde has really solved any problems. On the contrary, his study serves chiefly to show us how little we know about linguistic phenomena. We have barely scratched the surface of our subject.

Oma Stanley in *The Speech of East Texas*¹² presents a competent analysis of the pronunciation of English current in eastern Texas. The work falls into four chapters, devoted respectively to stressed vowels, unstressed or weakly stressed vowels, consonants and illustrative texts. These chapters are followed by three appendices. Appendix A (seven pages) takes up "grammar" (i. e. morphology); Appendix B (two pages) is a list of sentences, duly transcribed, in illustration of low colloquial speech; Appendix C (13 pages) deals with the origins of the Texan population. The appendices, though not without interest, might have been dispensed with, or (in the case of C) taken care of in the introduction, but the body of the work gives us a careful, detailed, and accurate study, a credit to the author and to Columbia University, where it was submitted as a doctoral dissertation. It would be interesting to know whether the East Texans pronounce *real* (p. 7) and *reel* alike. The author says nothing of a long vowel in *yes* (p. 11); is the vowel of this word actually always short in East Texas?

¹² American Speech Reprints and Monographs, No. 2; Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1937; pp. x, 135; \$2.50.

Since a stop can be and often is held as long as a fricative, the term *continuants* for fricatives (p. 23) is unscientific. I find it hard to believe that *no* in East Texas never has the pronunciation [no] or [nou], in spite of the author's silence on the point (p. 24); what of such a sentence as *no relief yet from the heat*? The author was ill advised in using that monstrosity of a term *plosives* (p. 55) instead of *stops*. It is hardly right to say that [j] was lost in *figured* (p. 57), since the current [j] is probably due to spelling-pronunciation. The pret. pl. *begun* (96) is an old form, not derivable from the past participle. I have noted a misprint on p. 104.

Phil. Karl Thielke has made a discriminating study of current slang,¹³ supported by many well-chosen examples from a variety of sources; he includes also a number of colloquialisms and cant terms. He divides his study into three parts. In the first, the material is classified according to its origin; in the second, according to its form; in the third, according to its meaning. The classes set up are well considered and useful, though not exhaustive. Since the material given is presented for purposes of illustration only, one can hardly blame the author for leaving out this or that, but the list of takings from German is so short that one wonders at the omission of *dumb* 'stupid' and *burg* 'town' (p. 50). *Mug up* and *mug away* (p. 19) differ in that the former is perfective, the latter imperfective. Partridge marks *smug* sb. 3 (p. 20) obsolescent, and the author ought to have recorded this mark with the rest of the quotation. *Pal* and *chum* (p. 31) differ considerably in their associations. *Wangle* (p. 45) is best defined as 'obtain by diplomacy or artifice' (Wyld, *Universal Dict.*). *Lark* (p. 47) is wrongly derived from OE *lác*; it actually comes from the name of the bird. *Peak*y (p. 48) may also take the form *peaked* (disyllabic). *Mugwump* (p. 51) is inadequately defined. *Bat an eyelid* (p. 53) is used only in the negative. *Come off it* (p. 55) implies coming down from a platform, a pedestal or some other high and mighty spot and facing the facts. *Crack* (p. 55) is probably an abbreviation of *wisecrack* (p. 62), and *nerts* (p. 58) is an arbitrary alteration of *nuts* 'crazy' (p. 177). *Stooge* (p. 61) is a foil rather than a fool; it is also used in the sense 'tool.' *Uplift* (p. 61) is regularly used as a term of disparagement. *Making whoopee* (p. 62) is said of public or communal noisy fun, and 'enjoy oneself' is hardly an adequate gloss. *Sissy* (p. 72) means 'effeminate man.'

¹³ *Slang und Umgangssprache in der englischen Prosa der Gegenwart*; Münsterer Anglistische Studien, Heft 4; H. & J. Lechte, Emsdetten, 1938; pp. 234; RM 6. 75.

The chapter on short forms (pp. 75 ff.) includes many rare or nonce-words hardly worth recording. *Raft* would go well with *oodles* and *skads* (p. 116). *Dinky* (p. 117) has a bad sense in America. The nonce word *pipterino* (p. 120) seems to be an altered form of *pippin* (p. 121). The meanings given for *plant* and *sell* (p. 132) do not agree with the illustrative quotations. *Sock* (p. 138) means not so much 'a beating' as 'a blow.' *Dime* (p. 142) is not slang but the official name of the coin. *Dog's dinner* (p. 147) remains enigmatic in the absence of a reference to *doggy* 'stylish' and the like. *Nib* (p. 153) is to be derived, with Wyld, from *nib* 'nose, face,' though I differ from Wyld in connecting it with the first rather than the second of the two meanings. A person who feels his importance is said to walk with his nose in the air; hence the figurative use of *nib* to mean a person of importance. *His nibs* and *her nibs* seem to be patterned on *His Royal Highness* or some such expression. A sound etymology of *filly* 'girl' (p. 159) will be found in the *NED*. *Flabbergast* (p. 181) is rarely if ever used except for the past participle, and the participial, not the infinitive form should be the one listed. *Bacon* as a mark of success (p. 191) goes back to Chaucer at least. I have noted misprints on pp. 1 (footnote), 104, 123, 151.

William Matthews describes his *Cockney Past and Present*¹⁴ as a "short history of the dialect of London." He might have added that it was written more for the general public than for the learned. As a popular presentation of the subject it has merit, and can be commended, though the proof-reading might have been better (e. g. on pp. 7 f.). But as a piece of research it must be called superficial; indeed, elementary mistakes are not wanting, e. g. the interpretation of *moe* and *mo* (pp. 11, 23) as "phonetic spellings" of *more*, and various explanations of a like kind on p. 22. Such errors indicate an imperfect knowledge both of phonetics and of the history of the language, faults which time and study will no doubt remedy, but which have left their mark on this book. The truth of the matter is that our academic system tends to force a young scholar into print too soon, and when he has a subject so attractive as is Cockney English the temptation to get out a book as soon as possible becomes the harder to resist. But the author had other motives. He wished to defend Cockney English against its traducers, and to convince the learned that here was a subject worthy of their attention. As he puts it (p. xiv),

The present book is an attempt to remedy some of the injuries of Cockney by tracing, so far as the available material will permit, the growth of the

¹⁴ Dutton, New York, 1938; pp. xvi, 245; \$2.65.

vulgar speech of London from the sixteenth century until the present day. . . . I shall feel amply satisfied if I merely succeed in correcting some popular errors concerning the dialect and in persuading English philologists that æsthetic and moral dislike of vulgar forms of speech are inadequate reasons for leaving them to be dealt with by foreigners.

He has certainly succeeded, I should say, in reaching both these objectives, and his book ought to lead to further work in the field.

During the period covered by this survey, one more volume of the great Danish dictionary, and four more instalments of the lamented Schröder's English-German dictionary have appeared.¹⁵ Both these works maintain the high standard set at the beginning. A dictionary of another kind is *The English Duden*.¹⁶ This work bears the sub-title "Picture Vocabularies in English." It contains some 30,000 words explained by pictures. The words are listed in the first or English index of 166 pages, where one finds the number of the plate on which the word is given pictorial explanation. A German index of 133 pages is also given, and the preface and introduction are bilingual. As far as it goes, the volume will serve as a German-English and (less conveniently) English-German dictionary. Opposite each plate the pictures on the plate are explained (in English), so that one can hardly go wrong. The authors have a good command of English, though now and then they make slips; they rarely take account of American usage. The table of contents is a list of the plates, arranged according to subject, and it is possible to use the book to good effect without referring to the index at all.

Otto Jespersen in his *Analytic Syntax*¹⁷ has worked out a system of symbols useful in sentence analysis. By substituting the appropriate symbols for the words or word-groups that make up the sentence, the syntactical structure may be brought out much as a chemical formula brings out the elements of a salt or acid. Thus, S stands for subject, V for verb, O for direct object, O for indirect object. In the teaching of syntax in the schools, such a system might be used instead of the diagrams once a regular part of grammatical drill. Some system of analysis is certainly desirable, not only for pedagogical reasons but also because of its scientific fruits. As Jespersen remarks (p. 15),

¹⁵ *Ordbog over det danske Sprog*, xvii. Bind: præst-ruæg; Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1937; pp. 748. *Englisches Handwörterbuch*, von M. M. A. Schröder; Lieferungen 2-5, Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1937-8; pp. 65-384, applaud-deploy; RM 2. 25 each.

¹⁶ Adapted from Duden's *Bildwörterbuch* by H. Klien and M. Ridpath-Klien; G. E. Stechert & Co., New York, 1937; pp. xvi, 662, 166, 133; 342 plates plus 6 colored plates; \$2.40.

¹⁷ Allen & Unwin, London, 1937; pp. 170.

the elaboration of the present system has opened my eyes to the real character of many things even in the languages I was most familiar with. . . . Much that we are apt to take for granted in everyday speech and consider as simple or unavoidable discloses itself on being translated into symbols as a rather involved logical process. . . .

The system which Jespersen has worked out has many advantages and deserves wide application and serious study. It is to be hoped that an outline of it will be included in future editions of his admirable schoolbook, *Essentials of English Grammar*, and that through its use syntactical study will become more meaningful to the student than it now is.

I will conclude this survey with a brief consideration of three books of a more general character.¹⁸ President Callahan's interesting volume falls into three parts: first, a general part, called "Language Studies," in which the author surveys his subject historically and philosophically; second, a syntactical part, called "Principles of Grammar"; and third, a morphological part, called "Grammatical Etymology." Phonology is not taken up. The author seems not to be a professional linguist, and much of what he says would be challenged in professional circles, but his point of view and method of approach command respect, and he has something to contribute. Mr Wilson gives to his book the sub-title, "Its [i. e. Language's] Place in World Evolution and its Structure in Relation to Space and Time," and in his preface he tells us that he has "attempted a philosophical exposition of language." Exceedingly little of the book is taken up with linguistics in the ordinary sense of that word; the author is concerned rather to relate the rise of language to the differentiation of man from the other animals. His main thesis may well be right; he certainly argues the case well, and he has produced a readable and stimulating book. Demonstration is impossible, however, at our present stage of development, whatever the theory about the origin of speech. In particular, the rise of man, and of language with him, was surely a much slower business than the author seems to think, and the first man hardly had that mastery of time and space which his offspring were to gain. The late Dr Goldberg chose for his book a title bound to offend the linguist, and in his sub-title, "An Introduction to Language for Everyman," he announced in so many words that he was writing for non-professional readers. But we read in his introduction (p. viii) that "no pains have been spared"

¹⁸ *Science of Language*, by J. J. Callahan; Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, 1938; pp. 235, v. *The Birth of Language*, by R. A. Wilson; J. M. Dent & Sons, London, 1937; pp. xii, 202. *The Wonder of Words*, by Isaac Goldberg; D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1938; pp. xiv, 485; \$3.75.

to make the book "exact, scientific, and . . . not too simple." Further, we are told that "the various chapters have been read by specialists in the particular fields." We have, then, a right to expect a work of vulgarization marked by scholarly accuracy in its generalizations and in its details. And in fact the book is much better than its title would indicate; it is full of good things. But I can not agree with the author of the foreword (p. xii) that it is a "masterly treatment" of its subject. The author was assuredly much interested in language, and he had done much reading in the field, but he did not master his subject. On the contrary, he remained the amateur from first to last, and depended on others for his final judgments. The book includes a number of slips, but these are of less importance than the many discussions of linguistic commonplaces, discussions in the main correct enough but not satisfactory because they were not written by a master. The author's obviously limited understanding of the phenomena with which he dealt made it impossible for him to bring out the points as they should be brought out, even if he usually succeeded in avoiding palpable errors. Such books ought to be written by the learned, not by the laity. But if the learned fail to do their duty by the general public, men like Dr Goldberg cannot be blamed for leaping into the breach, and this particular book, in spite of grave deficiencies, has much to commend it. The author's general attitude toward linguistic phenomena is sound, and his volume will be found worth the while of the readers for whom it was written.

KEMP MALONE

REVIEWS

The Poetical Career of Alexander Pope. By ROBERT KILBURN ROOT. Princeton (The University Press), 1938. Pp. vii + 248. \$2.50.

This book is another effective episode in the rehabilitation of Pope's reputation as a poet. Prejudice against Pope has greatly lessened; but, as Dean Root tells us in his preface, "there remains much in the poetic art of Pope that needs for modern readers interpretation and fresh appraisal." In a "series of essays," as he modestly calls his chapters, "for the most part arranged in such an order as to suggest the progress of his literary career," we survey

Pope's work, using the facts of his career as they throw light on the quality of his work.

The volume does not pretend to biographical novelty, and it hardly brings to bear on Pope's individual idiom the acute observation that makes Mr. Tillotson's book serviceable. Not that Root does not give us valuable observations—his insistence on the paragraph, frequently of sonnet-length, as a unit in Pope's expression is an example—but his field is rather general formative influences or interpretative ideas and not specific observations on passages. The first chapter sketches the "canons" of Pope's art—what poetry meant to him: his supposed attitudes toward Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, and Dryden are noted, and there is a more general statement concerning the influence of France and ancient Rome. In this volume, however, neither Horace nor Boileau is writ large. The second chapter ("The Heroic Couplet") is one of the best in the volume, and it presents well Pope's favorite verse form—though neglecting to mention the best things he did outside this form.

With these two chapters of preliminary interest behind us we come to about 75 pages on the earlier poems of Pope and about the same number on the *Dunciad* and later poems. The Imitations of Horace seem not much to interest Root. There is doubtless more of obvious "fancy" and "invention" in the works antedating 1717, and Root is pleased to stress the "romantic" aspects of these works. The word "romantic" for him seems not merely to describe certain tendencies of a period later than Pope's but also to be a word of absolute and high commendation. One must question the justness of an understanding or admiration of Pope that depends on his relation to "romantic" habits of mind—however such habits may be defined.

Pope's art is essentially (but not always) public rather than personal, oratorical rather than lyrical. It is rhetorical in the noble sense of that word—a sense that calls for no apology. His concept of poetry is rightly described here as that of "an exacting social art," but the true nobility of the definition is not adroitly presented. It can be seen in that aspect of Pope's optimism which held that in the past whenever society, government, morals have been in peril, always some

Poet or Patriot rose but to restore
The Faith and Moral, Nature gave before;
Re-lum'd her ancient light, not kindled new;
If not God's image, yet his shadow drew . . .

A *very* exacting social game this, and one that goes somewhat beyond "witty epigram" and "playful fancy" (p. 166). Pope took his rôle as satirist more seriously than Root admits. In fact, either modern aestheticians or modern classroom listeners have so much aversion to "reform" and to "moralizing" that these two words

are here used but gingerly. Satire, we are told (p. 196), "requires vision and creative imagination." But just as essential as these is a fine, sure sense of values. (Such a sense Jonathan Swift had; and it is almost sacrilege to call Value as preached by him "Satanic" [p. 193].) The chapter on "The Art of Satire" is perhaps most of all Root's chapters open to basic, if transparent, objection. One other unpalatable idea is the echoed concept of the period as "one of the rare periods in the history of thought when all men, or nearly all, are agreed in essentials as to what we ought to do and think, and dispute only as to methods, or as to corollaries of the main propositions" (p. 179). Can we here be reading about the eighteenth century?

With regard to the important edition of Pope now in preparation in England Mr. Root has made small errors (p. 227), correction of which may save future embarrassment. It is being brought out by Methuen, and Mr. Ault's volume of Pope's early *Prose Works* (Blackwell, 1936) is not a part of the edition, which, I believe, includes only the poems (and not the Homer). For the Methuen edition Mr. Ault will do the miscellaneous poems. The editor of the *Dunciad* will be Professor J. R. Sutherland (not S. R., as he is here called on p. 237). A knowledge of a very neat article by another of these editors¹ would have improved an account of a vexed matter treated by Root on pages 90-91. These are petty mistakes, and there are not many such in the volume. With reservations on the one or two indicated points the book as a whole may be recommended as both illuminating and useful.

GEORGE SHERBURN

Columbia University

Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe in the Perspective of European Literature. By FRED O. NOLTE. Lancaster Press, Inc., Lancaster, Pa., 1938. 262 pp. \$2.50.

Against the broad background of European literature Professor Nolte has drawn three interesting studies of Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe. These studies are preceded by a chapter on "Subjectivity" and followed by one on "Artistry." According to the author subjectivity is the "seed as well as the soil of modern German literature and thought." (P. 5) Grillparzer, Lessing, and Goethe are, in varying degrees, not only representative of this subjectivity, but also of the introspective and polemical nature of German literature. The fact that the "Blütezeit" of German litera-

¹ Geoffrey Tillotson, "Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Pope's 'Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady'," *RES*, xii (1936), 401-12; esp. p. 402.

ture followed the Age of Enlightenment, whereas the great periods of English and French literature preceded it, has significant implications.

Professor Nolte regards Grillparzer as the dramatist of quietism whose heroines have "a pallor of the convent." While this can be accepted as characteristic of those mentioned by the author, it is not true of many who were omitted. This reviewer does not share with the author the feeling that it is a relief when Rahel von Toledo is "disposed of" nor that she is the least convincing of Grillparzer's women. Drawing her from his intimate knowledge of Marie Smolenitz Daffinger, Rahel's prototype, he was able to endow her with traits, which, albeit contradictory and far from admirable, were nevertheless true to the type she was supposed to represent.

The author pays tribute to Grillparzer's keenly inquiring intellect, by comparison with which he regards Schiller's mind as provincial and Hebbel's as barbaric. His "refined sensibility, his exceptionally wide perspective, and his pure devotion to poetry as poetry" finally paralyzed him as a dramatic poet, but made him a master in the art of literary appreciation. (P. 55) He concludes his fine appreciation of Grillparzer with these words: "In the catholic, delicate appreciation of things poetic and artistic, Grillparzer is not impossibly the most patiently and sensitively cultivated mind in the whole range of European letters." (P. 96)

Lessing, the outstanding representative of the *Aufklärung*, is considered by the author to be the greatest critic since Aristotle. This high place in the history of criticism is due to the fact that Lessing "shrewdly and honestly realized just how far criticism could go without making itself fatuous, or helpless, or unreadable." (P. 150) He is a critic's critic, a man whose maturity and sense of responsibility are fully mirrored in his life and work. His indomitable spirit remained uncowed. He was above all the disciple of truth, rather than the apostle of beauty. Regarding his *Faust*, the author makes the surprising statement that we should feel "slight regret" at its fragmentary state, because "Lessing's completed performance would have suffered immeasurably by comparison with Goethe's transcendent achievement." (P. 161)

Realizing the difficulty inherent in an attempt to fix the characteristic significance of a man like Goethe, a man who has the fullest claim to universality, the author succeeds rather well in his attempt to do so. He sees Goethe as an affirmer of life and as a man who was at his greatest as a counsellor, as a profoundly reflective poet, and as a poetically articulate thinker.

In his last chapter the author discusses the problem of art and artistic communication. He attacks the cult of "originality" and "genius" and expresses the view that the enlightenment of the three subjects of his book shows itself best in their realization of the literary delusions commonly involved in the conception of ori-

ginality. In discussing the pre-eminently social nature of art, he points out that the artist must think and feel in terms of others.

The book is, on the whole, an important contribution to the field of literary criticism. The author succeeds in seeing his three men in their proper perspective in the vast field of European literature, even though he limits most of his comparisons and allusions largely to English and French writers. His comments are at all times stimulating and provocative. The value of the book would be enhanced greatly by the presence of an index and a bibliography.

DOROTHY LASHER-SCHLITT

Brooklyn College

Hauptmann und Shakespeare. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Fortlebens Shakespeares in Deutschland. Von FELIX A. VOIGT und WALTER A. REICHART. Mit einem Aufsatz und dramatischen Szenen von Gerhart Hauptmann. Breslau: Maruschke & Berendt Verlag, 1938. Pp. viii, 154.

Die soziale, politische und wirtschaftliche Zeitkritik im Werke Gerhart Hauptmanns. Von HERMANN BARNSTORFF. Jena: Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1938. Pp. 155.

Felix Voigt has become known in the world of Hauptmann scholarship for his valuable studies on various aspects of Gerhart Hauptmann's life and work. In the present volume he is joined by Professor Reichart in an investigation of Hauptmann's relation to Shakespeare. The study begins with a sketch of Hauptmann's first contacts with Shakespeare's dramas during his Breslau days and traces the influence of Shakespeare on his early dramatic endeavors: the *Lykophron* plan, *Germanen und Römer*, the *Kynast* fragment and the proposed tragedy of Anthony and Cleopatra. There follows an analysis of *Schluck und Jau* and *Indipohdi*. The former play, the authors argue, owes more to *Timon of Athens* than to *The Taming of the Shrew*, while *Indipohdi* is traced to its earliest form in the fragment *Die Insel*, a paraphrase of Shakespeare's *Tempest*.

The core of the book, however, is the third chapter, which discusses Hauptmann's preoccupation with the problems of *Hamlet* during the decade from 1925 to 1936. There is a thorough analysis of Hauptmann's criticism of Shakespeare's tragedy, a comparison with Goethe's standpoint on the same subject, and a critical appraisal of Hauptmann's reconstructed *Hamlet*. Chapter 4 discusses *Hamlet in Wittenberg* and *Im Wirbel der Berufung*, and the last chapter attempts a general comparison between the two dramatists and offers valuable material on Hauptmann's conception of

tragedy and of the tragic hero. An appendix reprints an interesting and not easily accessible essay of Hauptmann's on the text of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, five passages of his own composition which Hauptmann inserted in his translation of *Hamlet*, and the opening speech of I, 2 lines 1-39 in the English version, in Schlegel's translation and in Hauptmann's rendering.

The individual reader may differ with the authors on certain minor points of interpretation; but the work as a whole is a thorough piece of scholarship and a valuable aid to a true understanding of Hauptmann's mind.

Dr. Barnstorff's book is far broader in scope. It is a detailed investigation of Hauptmann's views on the social questions which have agitated our age. Part I enumerates the various periods of history and the geographical locations in which Hauptmann's works are set, and the vocations of his major and minor characters. Part II analyzes Hauptmann's attitude to the State, militarism, imperialism, the family, feminism, motherhood and children, illegitimacy, alcoholism, crime, treason, perjury, prostitution, school and church, clergymen and Roman Catholicism.

The study is certainly thorough and well documented. But one wonders whether there is really much point in looking for a social philosophy in Hauptmann's writings. Can Hauptmann be said to have worked out for himself a systematic attitude towards these problems that Dr. Barnstorff investigates? I have never been able to see Hauptmann as a "thinker" and Dr. Barnstorff's book has not converted me. Indeed it seems to me that Herr Voigt and Professor Reichart might have listed among their similarities between Shakespeare and Hauptmann this recurring tendency to thrust them into the ranks of the philosophers, instead of allowing them to rest on their laurels as creative artists.

Dr. Barnstorff is too often inclined to take the casual remark of a character as evidence of a belief which Hauptmann holds (pp. 63, 74, 91, 95, 104). Or he assumes that because von Wehrhahn is depicted as an object of ridicule, all his views must be contrary to those of Hauptmann (p. 79). This is, of course, an unwarranted conclusion. Hauptmann is too good an artist to create angels and monsters. Wehrhahn is a human being with good and bad qualities of character. And in one instance Dr. Barnstorff attributes to Hauptmann a view which is obviously stated ironically (p. 114).

There are a few slight misprints: p. 73, line 9 *verzugsweise* should read *vorzugsweise*; p. 96, line 4 *Ruschwey* should read *Ruschewey*; p. 104, line 13 *Büchner* should read *Buchner*; p. 119, line 5 from the bottom *'nen* should read *'n*; p. 124, line 22 *sein* should read *seine*; p. 131, line 25 *Orginski* should read *Oginski*.

H. STEINHAEUER

University of Saskatchewan

Die Entstehung der romanischen Völker. Von WALTHER VON WARTBURG. Halle a/Saale: 1939. Pp. 180. 18 esquisses, 5 cartes.

M. von Wartburg en plus du talent d'organisateur qu'il a amplement démontré dans son FEW, et de celui du linguiste que je qualifierais volontiers de "géopolitique" (en tant que considérant, ainsi que son collaborateur germanisant Th. Frings, les *Sprachräume* comme des centres dynamiques, cf. p. ex. des expressions comme, p. 68, "der neue Blutkreislauf des Reichs"), a un grand don pour la vulgarisation claire, aimable et bien ordonnée. C'est dire que son livre sur la genèse des peuples romans, qui élargit ses travaux préalables sur les causes de la différenciation linguistique dans la Romania occidentale jusqu'à des dimensions interromanes, est bien réussi. Je me demande si le titre qui propose l'étude de la genèse des *peuples* romans (et pas seulement des langues romanes, qu'il avait traitées jusqu'ici), n'est pas par trop ambitieux, vu que ce que l'auteur apporte de nouveau, c'est la comparaison des constats des linguistes (et particulièrement ceux de v. Wartburg lui-même, point ceux de ses critiques, p. ex. M. Schürr) avec ceux des historiens. La préhistoire *intérieure* des *peuples* romans me semble encore rester à écrire: je crois qu'on devra alors compenser la *Ausgliederung*, la séparation et différenciation des peuples romans, par l'esprit d'unité de la *Romania*, conception chère aux romanisants depuis G. Paris et revivifiée par Pirenne. La conception de la Romania est en effet singulièrement pâle et étriquée chez M. v. Wartburg: c'est une notion à caractère privatif: "durch das gemeinsame sprachliche Erbe *allein* [souligné par moi] sind *ja*[?] die romanischen Völker zu einer Einheit verbunden." Que M. v. W. se détrompe en lisant dans *GGA* 1933, p. 332 les remarques judicieuses de M. Auerbach sur l'unité des *littératures* romanes et ailleurs sur la notion de la *Vulgärantike*, l'héritage ancien légué aux peuples romans et qui forme le pendant culturel exact du *latin vulgaire*!

On notera un certain engouement pour les Germains (p. ex. ce qu'on appelle en général une "invasion germanique" est ici une "Landnahme"; à la p. 64, en rétrospective l'histoire des insuccès militaires des Romains en Germanie montre à M. v. W. une action de la Providence qui, après avoir "gaspillé les forces indoeuropéennes" au bord de la Méditerranée, a gardé en réserve "une dernière source de force populaire intacte et entière" pour renouveler l'Occident exténué—est-ce un spenglérisme mis à la page?), une aversion un peu trop marquée, pour ne pas être du à des idées courantes sur l'influence sémitique, pour le "artfremder Maure" en Espagne, qui n'aurait, contrairement à ce que nous savons par les travaux de Menéndez Pidal, agi que négativement (alors que la fusion des races germanique et romane était productive), et une belle adhésion

(plus ferme que pour la Belgique) aux idéaux d'une Suisse racialement et linguistiquement diversifiée, mais unifiée par la *Schicksalsgemeinschaft*¹ multiséculaire et par sa liberté.

Le volume intéressant de M. v. W. est dédié à son collègue de Chicago, William A. Nitze.

LEO SPITZER

Lingua e cultura (studi linguistici). By GIULIO BERTONI. Florence: Olschki. 1939. Pp. 301.

Ce livre contenant des articles publiés antérieurement et qui forme une trilogie avec les volumes "*Lingua e Pensiero*" (1932) et "*Lingua e Poesia*" (1937), s'inspire comme les autres des idées de Croce sur *l'espressione* comme principe fondamental de la langue et, par conséquent, de la linguistique. Ce sont des études particulièrement de stylistique, qui relient des faits observés par l'auteur en italien et en galloroman à des faits de civilisation connus. On remarquera aussi des études ressortissant à la politique (politique linguistique, s'entend), sur l'expansion de l'italien et sur 'l'ancienne et la nouvelle *questione della lingua*' (ici j'aurais aimé qu'à l'idée du Dante, modelée sur ses conceptions de la divinité, de la langue nationale ne s'identifiant avec nul dialecte et pourtant immanente dans chacun, fût rendue la justice qu'elle mérite: elle peut ne pas être vraie au point de vue de la genèse de l'italien—d'ailleurs il y a des langues qui sont nées ainsi que le Dante le postule pour l'italienne—, elle est certainement vraie au point de vue *phénoménique* et les suggestions de M. Bertoni lui-même, d'unifier l'italien en mettant en accord les prononciations de Florence et de Rome avec les postulats de la linguistique, sont bien dans la ligne dantéenne). On goûtera particulièrement les études, d'une philologie solide, sur la prose de la *Vita nuova*, sur la langue de Renée de France dans ses lettres, sur l'origine de la préposition italienne *da* (= *unde* + *ad*) et sur les reflets de coutumes juridiques dans la poésie des troubadours: ce dernier article, merveilleux par les multiples connaissances de détails réunies pour établir un

¹ Dois-je dire que la conception renanienne du peuple comme unité s'affirmant par un "plébiscite le tous les jours" me semble plus conforme à la réalité que la soumission passive à un *fatum* qui est en somme le *factum* historique? L'expression "Entstehung der . . . Völker" a pour moi une nuance rationaliste qui jure avec ce fatalisme. On pourrait dire: M. v. W. ne semble réaliser ni ce que sont des *peuples* romans ni des *peuples romans*. Je me demande quelle peut être sa définition de l'esprit *européen*: à coup sûr, antipode de celle de Valéry (Hellade—Rome—chrétienté), elle inclurait les Germains—on n'ose pas penser qu'elle exclurait la Grèce dont il est fait si peu de cas dans ce livre. Pour M. v. W., le motto d'une revue romanistique bien connue devrait être varié ainsi: "Non esiste la latinità; razze germaniche esistono" . . .

trait de style général, rejoint celui de M. Wechssler sur les expressions féodales et ceux de M. Scheludko sur les expressions tirées de la rhétorique en a. prov. et nous porte à admettre un certain "réalisme des troubadours" (d'ailleurs bien connu par les *sirventes*), à savoir une inclusion d' à peu près toutes les connaissances du moyen âge, cette "Weltbreite" affleurant sous forme de métaphores dans une poésie soi-disant idéaliste qui, en affirmant le spirituel, ne tourne pas le dos au monde—comme la *domna* chantée par les troubadours, toute idéale qu'elle paraît, est une femme bien vivante, ne se refusant pas au monde et à la société.

La science de M. Bertoni est elle-même définie par cette *domna* provençale: elle est spirituelle, tout en ne refusant pas des assises solides dans la réalité. Je dois dire que, des deux manières que cultive ce savant, l'investigation réaliste et le programme idéaliste (qui se trouve ici exprimé en beaucoup de lieux, particulièrement dans le prologue et l'épilogue du livre), j'aime mieux la première: M. Bertoni est le plus convaincant idéaliste quand il se meut parmi les matériaux qu'il domine si bien, les littératures et les langues du moyen âge français et italien,—moins quand il fait de la théorie. Faudrait-il encore évoquer la comparaison de cette *domna* provençale dont le sourire est divin quand il éclôt sur cette bouche *visible*, mais qui a moins su nous transmettre sa pensée, toute de spiritualité? Ou, pour employer un parallèle plus viril, M. Bertoni est comme le peintre dont la vie intime la plus intense s'épanche déjà dans le broyement, le choix et le groupement des couleurs: l' "idée" de la peinture ressort le mieux, non pas quand il parle d'elle, mais quand il emploie ses couleurs, ses matériaux bien-aimés: "Il ne peut qu'il ne voie ce à quoi il songe et songe ce qu'il voit. Ses moyens même font partie de l'espace de son art. Point de chose plus vivante aux regards qu'une boîte de couleurs ou une palette chargée," a écrit Valéry de l'artiste. Diminuerai-je le grand savant qu'est M. Bertoni en désirant le voir toujours tout près de ses "boîtes de couleurs" et laisser à Croce l'élaboration de la philosophie du langage, assuré que je suis que Bertoni philologue donnera toujours une vue spiritualiste plus graphique que s'il se meut dans l'air raréfié des idées pures? Je crois en effet que le grand philologue contribue à l'idéalité de sa science en la traduisant par la *peinture*: il est plutôt *traducteur* d'idées en matière sensible, qu'idéateur. La pensée philologique, comme toute autre, est la plus active en tant qu'*incarnée*.

P. 80: L'assertion "il francese *acheter* (comperare) . . . è di derivazione genovese," ainsi exprimée, me semble surprenante.—P. 86: les langues germaniques n'auraient pas de termes empruntés à l'italien pour la vie intérieure? Et *dolce far niente*, *morbidezza* etc.!—P. 151: je ne comprends pas bien l'explication d' a. prov. *beure sa folia* 'supporter les conséquences de la propre folie' par l'amende employée pour acheter du vin *pour le juge*. Il faudrait p.-ê. citer l'article de Schutz-Gora, *Germ.-rom. Monatschr.* IV, 277.—P. 159; il faudra traiter *de sus del cap li ren mo gatge* ensemble

avec l'all. *überhaupt*, qui au moyen âge a signifié 'ohne die Stücke zu zählen, ganz, all' (*man gab in daz vihe umb ein bescheiden gelt über haupt; er gewan Rôme über houbet*, Lexer): ce sera le geste de la soumission *absolue*, qui contient aussi la soumission *totale*. De là le sens de m. h. a. *über houbet fechten* 'wider den strom schwimmen' (*Dtsch. Wb.* s. v. *überhaupt*, A 1), c. à d. 'faire quelque chose d'inutile.'—P. 172, n. 1: lire McKenzie au lieu de K. Kenzie.—P. 253: l'article sur la langue de Rabelais me semble moins original que les autres: M. B. est encore sous l'emprise de l'idée du "hardi rationaliste" qu' a lancée l'école française, et ne voit pas assez le caractère rationnel-irrationaliste du plus grand poète "cosmique" de la France. V. mon article dans *Rom. Stil- und Literaturstudien* II.

LEO SPITZER

Un Philosophe Cosmopolite du XVIII^e Siècle, le Chevalier de Chastellux. Par FANNY VARNUM. Paris: Librairie Rodstein, 1936. Pp. 269.

François-Jean de Beauvoir, chevalier, puis marquis de Chastellux, soldat, philosophe, économiste, auteur de comédies et de nombreux essais, esprit cosmopolite et encyclopédique, méritait mieux que les études fragmentaires qui lui avaient été jusqu'ici consacrées. Sans être un auteur de premier plan, il fut un témoin significatif, un exemple marquant de ces aristocrates, assez nombreux à la fin du dix-huitième siècle, qui s'étaient libérés presque entièrement des préjugés de leur caste, tout en conservant une grande élégance de manières. Homme du monde, homme de goût, d'intellect affiné, anglophile mais non pas "anglomaniac," ami enthousiaste mais non pas aveugle des "Insurgents," tel nous l'a dépeint avec justesse Miss Varnum dans une monographie bien documentée et simplement écrite. Son œuvre dramatique est mince et peut sans inconvénient être négligée. Par contre ses essais constituent des documents précieux sur les modifications que subissait le goût à la fin du dix-huitième siècle, sur la pénétration des influences anglaises et sur les modes littéraires. Disciple de Montesquieu, disciple de Voltaire, disciple de Hume, conservant cependant quelque indépendance de jugement, Chastellux apporte le témoignage d'un homme moyen et cultivé. Ceci dit, il faut reconnaître que cette modération même qui paraît dans le traité de la *Félicité publique* l'a empêché d'exercer une action forte sur un public ami des opinions tranchées, des paradoxes et des systèmes. Aujourd'hui encore, son principal titre reste les deux volumes des *Voyages dans l'Amérique Septentrionale dans les années 1780, 1781 et 1782* (Paris, 1786). Aussi devons-nous remercier Miss Varnum d'avoir donné en appendice des extraits de l'ouvrage dont il n'existe pas de réimpression moderne. On y verra comment le voyageur français a su observer, peindre et faire vivre les personnages les plus marquants de la Révolution américaine et des forces expéditionnaires françaises, de Washington à Robert

Morris, de Lafayette au fameux Colonel Armand. Tout en notant la place faite à l'étude des *Voyages* et aux controverses qui suivirent la publication, on peut trouver que la monographie de Miss Varnum tourne un peu court. Les dernières années de la vie de Chastellux sont condensées en un paragraphe bien sec (p. 199). Il ne semble même pas que la date de la mort du marquis ait été indiquée. On ne saurait en faire une critique très grave à l'auteur qui a été la première à indiquer et à regretter les lacunes forcées de son travail, dues au refus des descendants de Chastellux de laisser consulter les archives familiales. Elle pourra se consoler en songeant qu'elle est ainsi admise dans l'honorable mais trop nombreuse société des historiens que des dragons jaloux ont écartés de la toison d'or.

GILBERT CHINARD

Princeton University

Crime and Punishment in the Old French Romances. By F. CARL RIEDEL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. viii + 197. \$2. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, No. 135).

In supplying a commentary on crime, criminals, trials, and punishments in a selected group of Old French romances Mr. Riedel has written an interesting and useful book. Usually his comments are convincing and even when they are not, they are highly suggestive. No scholar who is dealing with these romances can afford to neglect Mr. Riedel's work. Moreover although Mr. Riedel seems to have written his book for this special audience, I believe that mediaeval historians in general can draw some benefit from it. The social historian who wishes to use the extensive material supplied by contemporary literature is always faced with the problem of deciding how accurately the romances depict the actual life and thoughts of their day. By comparing the treatment of criminals in the romances with that prescribed by contemporary customary law Mr. Riedel has supplied a touch-stone which this reviewer at least expects to find very useful. Furthermore it seems possible that this book may contain an interesting suggestion for the legal historian. Mr. Riedel has used the legal sources to explain the romances. Might not legal historians reverse the process and seek in contemporary literature useful comments on their legal texts?

The chief general criticism that may be made of Mr. Riedel's work is that he is too liberal in his definition of "contemporary customary law." He is fully aware of this danger, but is inclined to forget it when he comes to explaining incidents in the romances. For instance it seems highly improbable that a thirteenth century

trouvère knew anything about the *Lex Burgundionum*. The chapter entitled "criminal law in the thirteenth century" is not very satisfactory. Mr. Riedel attempts to discuss this subject in greater detail than his book requires or his knowledge justifies. As a result he not only presents many facts which simply confuse the reader but he also falls into several minor errors. The mistakes on page fifteen may be taken as fair samples. The king of France in 1191 was not Philip I but Philip II. Then the statement "the viscount presided over regional courts under royal jurisdiction" is very questionable. Not until they absorbed Normandy did the French kings have local officers called viscounts and then only in that province. Moreover even in Normandy the viscount's own jurisdiction extended to only the most minor offences. When he presided over courts dealing with serious cases, it was as a deputy of the bailli, the real local officer of the Capetian kings. But these are insignificant errors which detract in no way from the value of Mr. Riedel's book.

SIDNEY PAINTER

The Johns Hopkins University

Studies in Modern Romansh Poetry in the Engadine. By MILDRED ELIZABETH MAXFIELD. Planographed by Edwards Bros., Ann Arbor, Mich., 1938. Pp. xi + 310.

Miss Maxfield has certainly done a service to the cause of Romance Linguistics by publishing this monograph. While Romansh (Surselvan and Ladin), for certain linguistic reasons, is not included in the field of Italian dialects, anyone who is thoroughly acquainted with the Northern dialects of Italy and is somewhat of a linguistic gymnast can read the selections in Miss Maxfield's book, which is in the nature of an Anthology of Modern Romansh Poetry, both with profit and pleasure. For many of the poems she has given her own excellent translations. The biographies of Pallioppi, Caderas, and Lansel are well done and the critical material is well handled. It is only to be regretted that on pp. 268-9, while dealing with the differences between Surselvan and Ladin, she did not include the phonetic symbols which would have made the reader more certain of the pronunciation indicated by the written word.

On pp. 36-8 mention is made of the manuscript of the dictionary compiled by Zaccaria Pallioppi and abridged for publication by his son Emil, and on p. 37 is given an extract from the MS. with the corresponding published abridgement. While the abridgement is well done, it is to be regretted that the entire work cannot be published, as the elder Pallioppi was a great pioneer scholar in his chosen field. Of course he lacked the tools which we have today

and which are contributing to bring the fields of phonetics and phonology into the realm of the more exact sciences. It is at least to be hoped that the manuscript can be preserved for scholars of this and future generations.

Friulians may not like Miss Maxfield's statement on p. 2 that their dialect "has never produced any considerable literature of value outside of a certain record of interesting folklore" as they point with pride to their Zorzut, but it is true that the language of Graubunden excels that of Friuli in literary value. For certain kinds of lyrics Romansh, like some of the Italian dialects, lacking in artificiality, is more expressive than the more polished languages. It attains charm through its freshness and *naïveté*. The sentiments are expressed in so intimate a manner that they seem to reveal the very soul of the poet. As an example let me cite the tenth stanza of Pallioppi's *Partenza*:

O craja, figl, che l'or nun detta,
Ne possa der felicitèd
Scha tû nun hest ün' orma netta
Ûn cour implieu da charited,

which, in order to illustrate the close relationship between Italian and Romansh I shall translate into Italian:

E credi, figlio, che l'oro non dà,
Nè puo dare la felicità
Se non hai l'anima pura,
Il cuore pieno di carità.

H. H. VAUGHAN

The University of California

Boccaccio's Story of Tito e Gisippo in European Literature. By
LOUIS SORIERI. New York: Institute of French Studies, 1937.
Pp. 268.

Dr. Sorieri has presented a noteworthy history of the origins and filiations of the 98th *novella* of the *Decameron*, in every field of literary endeavor for Italy, France, England, Germany, and Spain. The value of his investigations, however, would be considerably enhanced by restricting the analysis to close associations of the rival-friend plot. Although the Introduction warns that the study is limited "to an examination of all translations and direct adaptations of Tito and Gisippo and of as many derivations in each country as space and other factors permitted," the ensuing analysis wanders from the prescribed bounds. It is difficult to justify inclusion of distant antecedents such as the Stratonice-Seleucus, the half-friend, and the loyal-wife themes when many analogues involving the sacrificial motif in friendship are ignored. This incon-

sistency is further aggravated by the fact that the same yardstick is not used in all of the chapters.

Since the theme under discussion is a novellistic one, we may be excused for singling out the section devoted to the *novella* to develop the criticism.

In the 1st *novella* of Ser Giovanni's *Il Pecorone*, which introduces the analysis, there is not a single reference to either friend or friendship. If we justify its existence in this chapter on the ground that Masuccio's 21st *novella* is analogous to it, then it is reasonable to expect mention of Villegas' *Historia del Abencerraje y la hermosa Jarifa* in the chapter on Spain. Of Masuccio's collection Nos. 21, 38 and 44 are examined but No. 41 (repeated by Parabosco as No. 2 of his *Diporti*) which treats of a severe test of friendship under the guise of a crude practical joke, is absent. The related motif of the husband who forces a friend to test his wife for him is likewise missing from this chapter, although it occurs in the analysis of Greene's *Philomela* in the English section. Treatment of these motifs would add analogues from Sermini and Barbagli in Italian, and from Mateo Alemán and Cervantes in Spanish.

Some of the examples missing from the analysis are: for Italy—the twenty-fourth *novella* of Sercambi (Renier ed.); the second and fifth of Granucci's *L'Eremita, la Carcere e'l Diporto*, the sixth and seventh of Erizzo's *Sei Giornate*; the second of Brevio's *Novelle*, Bandello's twenty-seventh of Part I, and the fortieth of Part II; the sixth of Firenzuola (in spite of note 22, p. 75); the third and fourth of Zambrini's collected *Novelle Antiche*; for Spain—the nineteenth of Sanchez's *El Libro de los Exemplos por a. b. c.* (ed. Morel-Fatio, *Romania* vii [1878]); Ch. 31 of the *Castigos y Documentos del Rey Don Sancho*, B. A. E. li.

An acquaintance with Stith Thompson's *Motif Index of Folk-Literature* and the second volume of Di Francia's *Novellistica* (1925) would have added many more derivatives and analogues.

Notwithstanding such omissions Dr. Sorieri has succeeded in showing that a "rather continuous sequence exists in the successive treatment," and in the process, he has made available some extremely rare material. The study is a welcome addition to the study of inter-relationships.

D. P. ROTUNDA

Mills College, California

BRIEF MENTION

Joseph Bédier 1864-1938. By FERDINAND LOT. Paris: E. Droz, 1939. Pp. 53. This brief work by one distinguished mediaevalist about another, by a stylist about a stylist, by a friend about a friend,

is informative, scholarly, charming and—yes—amusing. Its account of Bédier's intellectual life and his solution of textual and literary problems, couched in the clear pleasing style we expect of even the most erudite French scholars, is peppered by humorous comments on personalities and institutions. The friendship which dictated the work did not involve harmonious opinion on all matters. Professor Lot frankly disagreed on the question of the spontaneous generation of the French epic, although he approved as "acquis et intangible" the theory of propagation of the epic on the pilgrim routes, by minstrels influenced by the tales and traditions of the sanctuaries at which they halted. On the point of disagreement Bédier had prepared to "exterminate" his friend: "Avec quelle émotion j'attendais cette joute suprême!" writes Lot. The little book follows Bédier from his school days at Louis le Grand to his establishment at the Collège de France, where until his retirement he held the chair that Gaston Paris had honoured. "Le trouvère Bédier" made his reputation by his *Roman de Tristan et Iseult*, reconstructed from the fragmentary XII century versions of Bérout and of Thomas. It was however to his more controversial *Légendes épiques* that he owed his greatest renown. To these may be added his editions and translations of the *Chanson de Roland*. Meanwhile in the realm of pure scholarship Bédier emasculated Lachmann's methods of manuscript classification and disposed of those of Dom Quentin. Of the events of his private life we learn nothing; of his behaviour therein much. He was as conformist there as, in the intellectual realm, he was "la tête la plus cartésienne que j'aie connue," refusing to accept unexamined dicta even from Gaston Paris. The end of Bédier's life came suddenly last summer. Lot and he parted in friendship after a garden party, convinced that their critical opinions were irreconcilable. "Il s'en alla de son pas léger, le port droit, le tête haute, à son habitude. Je ne devais plus le revoir." The few pages of the book give us—and with grace—a picture of the whole intellectual man. It should not escape the eye of those who care for scholarship.

CAROLINE RUUTZ-REES

Greenwich, Conn.

Poèmes de transition (XV^e-XVI^e siècle). Par MARCEL FRANÇON. Rondeaux du MS. 402 de Lille. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press and Paris: Droz, 1938. Pp. 771. In this volume M. Françon offers to scholars the 601 *rondeaux* of MS. 402 in the Bibliothèque de Lille. The collection embraces for the most part the reign of Louis XII, though there are scattered allusions in the poems to the early years of Francis I and an occasional backward glance at the period of Charles VIII. The verses, then, are transitional in a chronological sense and might be expected to give a foretaste of

later Renaissance literary trends. However, such is scarcely the case. The poems for the most part are steeped in the *rhétoriqueur* tradition of artificiality, flamboyance, and allegory. There are a few mythological references, but many more to the personages of the *Roman de la Rose*. Priam and his compatriots are met much less frequently than Danger, Faulx-Danger, Desespoir, and even Bel-Accueil. In addition to the stereotyped and standardized lovers' laments, some of the poems treat general subjects like Courtoisie, Mort, and Fortune, the last at times with a slight realistic touch. The authors are generally anonymous, but a number of the poems can be assigned to such well-known *rhétoriqueurs* as Jean Marot, Octovien de Saint-Gelais, Henri Baude, and Georges Chastellain. The collection was evidently destined for a society both aristocratic and literary, since the poets to whom the verses can be reasonably attributed were all living in the *entourages* of the royal courts of Charles VIII, Louis XII, and Francis I. Also, the poems themselves reveal in acrostichs the names of ladies like Louise de Savoie, Anne de Quesnai, Louise de Graville, and others. The pieces are all *rondeaux* of the type a a b b a, a a b R, a a b b a R, where R is the *rentrement*, or repetition of the first syllables of the first verse. M. F. has equipped his edition with a rather full introduction wherein he approaches the problem of what, when, and where was the Renaissance, a problem that has been occupying scholars anew in recent years, but is too ample for an introduction. M. F. rightly concludes that his series of *rondeaux* is no group of masterpieces. He is correct, though, in justifying his edition on the basis of its portrayal of "la pensée de nos aïeux" and of its giving "les indices d'une civilisation." Literary history does not have to concern itself solely with primary figures and movements. The work of M. Françon very properly contains a preface by Professor Henri Guy, whose study on *rhétoriqueur* poetry has so long been an accepted standard.

W. L. WILEY

The University of North Carolina

A Concordance of Ovid. By R. J. DEFERRARI, SISTER M. INVOLATA BARRY, MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE. Washington: Catholic University, 1939. Pp. ix + 2220 (lithotyped). \$20.00. The authors call this extensive work "a combination of concordance and *index verborum*," as they have wisely omitted a number of "constantly recurring and relatively colorless words." It will doubtless be found useful, if the price does not prove to be prohibitive, by students of modern languages and literatures as well as by students of Latin, for no author was better known during the Middle Ages and Renaissance than Ovid.

H. C. L.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

ALLEGORY IN THE FRENCH HEROIC POEM OF
THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY, *by* ARCHIMEDE
MARNI, 202 pp. 1936 \$2.50

THE BONDMAN, *by* PHILIP MASSINGER, *edited*
by BENJAMIN TOWNLEY SPENCER, 266 pp.
1932 \$3.00

CLASSICAL MYTHOLOGY IN THE PLAYS,
MASQUES, AND POEMS OF BEN JON-
SON, *by* CHARLES FRANCIS WHEELER, 220 pp.
1938 \$3.50

GOD IN GREEK PHILOSOPHY TO THE TIME
OF SOCRATES, *by* ROY KENNETH HACK, 160
pp. 1931 \$3.00

LUDWIG TIECK AND ENGLAND, *by* EDWIN
H. ZEYDEL, 264 pp. 1931 \$2.75

LUDWIG TIECK, THE GERMAN ROMAN-
TICIST, *by* EDWIN H. ZEYDEL, 406 pp. 1935 \$3.50

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY STUDIES, *edited*
by ROBERT SHAFER (*Philip Massinger*, *by* BEN-
JAMIN TOWNLEY SPENCER; *John Ford*, *by*
MARY EDITH COCHNOWER; *Samuel Butler*, *by*
DAN GIBSON, JR.), 335 pp. 1933 \$3.50

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY STUDIES: SEC-
OND SERIES, *edited by* ROBERT SHAFER
(*Francis Osborn's "Advice to a Son," by* SIEG-
MUND A. E. BETZ; *Dryden's Plays: A Study*
in Ideas, by MILDRED E. HARTSOCK; *Jeremy*
Collier's Essays, by KATHLEEN RESSLER), 295
pp. 1937 \$3.50



PUBLISHED BY

THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

For the

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Obra maestra de la ingeniería pedagógica

CASTILLO AND SPARKMAN'S
GRADED SPANISH READERS

I. DE TODO UN POCO

II. SIGAMOS LEYENDO

III. LA BUENAVENTURA Y OTROS CUENTOS

IV. AVENTURAS DE GIL BLAS

V. CERVANTES'S LA GITANILLA

28 cents each. One-volume edition, \$1.20

VI. UN VUELO A MÉXICO

VII. DE MÉXICO A GUATEMALA

32 cents each. Book VIII in preparation

IN THE HEATH-CHICAGO SPANISH SERIES

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO ATLANTA SAN FRANCISCO DALLAS LONDON

New — highly praised

THE COLLEGE BOOK OF ESSAYS

By JOHN ABBOT CLARK

Michigan State College

This collection of stimulating essays contains selections from the Greeks to the present, from Plato to James Thurber, with emphasis as much on style as on content. Lists of outstanding books, brief biographic sketches and excellent bibliographies are noteworthy features that help make the volume one of the most valuable texts in the field.

Price, \$2.00

A HANDBOOK of Essentials in English

By LAIRD BELL

Purdue University

Teacher's ANSWER BOOK to Exercises now ready

- Letter Symbols—A system of symbols which are actually abbreviations of the rules to which they refer.
- Limited Content—Emphasis is placed on the essential rules of grammar.
- Effective Exercises at Back of Book—Exercises are grouped together on perforated pages.
- Two Editions—A one-volume edition with both text and exercises, \$1.15; a two-volume edition with exercises in separate pamphlet, Vol. 1, \$1.00; Vol. 2, \$.50.

257 Fourth Avenue
New York, New York

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY